

Wing H 3707

A REPLY
TO THE
DEFENCE
OF
Dr. Stillingfleet;

BEING
A Counter Plot for *Union* between the *Protestants*, in opposition to the *Project* of others for *Conjunction* with the Church of Rome.

By the Authors
Of the *Modest and Peaceable Inquiry*.
Of the *Reflections*, (i.e.) the *Country Confor.*
Of the *Peaceable Designe*. m. 32. Humphrys

Then Abner called to Joab and said, shall the sword devour for ever? Knowest thou not that it will be bitterness in the latter end? How long shall it be then ere thou bid the people return from following their Brethren.

L O N D O N,
Printed for Thomas Parkhurst, at the Bible and three Crowns in
Cheapside near Mercers Chappel. 1682.

A
REPLY
TO THE
DEFENCE
OF
Dr. Stillington;

BEING
A Counter Plot for Union between the Pro-
testants in opposition to the Project of others
for Conjunction with the Church of Rome.

By the Authors
Of the Method and Penetrable Ignorance
Of the Religion, (i.e.) the Country Confor-
Of the Penetrable Designs.

When I first call'd to Lord and Lady, and the learned deans for
some I know not what to be the cause in the hands and
It is long since be then cretion bid the people return from Rome
and their worship.

LONDON
Printed for Thomas Taylor, at the Bible and three Crowns in
St. Pauls Church-yard, 1682.

To the Right Honourable
THE
EARL of HALLEWELL
May it please your Lordship

THE Design of these Papers
being for the Glory of the
King and the Peace of the Church;
we cannot think it dishonourable
for any person of moderate Inclina-
tions, and in a capacity to serve
so good an end, to favour it. Your
Lordship therefore being at pre-
sent at the Helm in the Admini-
stration of the greatest Affairs,
will not, as we hope, receive with
any Disdain this our humble De-
dication.

Not that we concerne your
Lordship in our little Contests, as
the Book is Controversal, for we
know Themistocles cannot fiddle, but
he can govern a State: but because

the Thing Designd is so momentous,
and concerns Statesmen, such as your
Lordship is.

We do intend, no further
avocation of your Honour from
your other Employment, than to
look over onely the Preface, and
the last Half Sheet of the Book:
wherein you will find a Founda-
tion laid, and Materials made rea-
dy. There is wanting onely the
Perfecting skill of some Master buil-
der; and then Hands to work.

We are sensible of the Meanness
of such an Offering to so great and
judicious a Person; and being con-
scious that the blame which we de-
serve upon that account is too
much for One, there are Two of us
to bear it.

Your Lordships humble Servants

John Humfrey,
Stephen Lob.

T H E

PREFACE.

IT hath pleased God, that the hearts of most men at this present juncture (or at least their faces) are set upon Union of the Protestants; and it is absolutely necessary that something be done in order to a firm and lasting one among us. Upon this point on all hands we seem to be agreed, We must Unite or we must be undone: but as for the means of obtaining this end, the differences are many.

Some among the Conformists seem to propose an Execution of the Penal Laws, as a sure way of Uniting us: Others (as this Author of *Dean Stillingfleet's Defence*, &c.) insist on a Submission to the Bishops of the Universal Church to be the only foundation of Unity in the Church. The Dissenters differ from such as are of these Opinions, and in the general assert, That if ever an Union be obtained, it must be by an Insisting only on a Few, Certain, Necessary things as terms of Communion. That the utmost severities of the Magistrate will rather, fill the minds of the Sufferers with Prejudices, against the Dictates of those men whose most powerful Argument is the Sword, than Enlighten their Judgments, or Dispose their Souls to any sincere Compliances; and that the Notion of our Author, to wit, the Defender of the Doctrines of Paul, is Schismatical.

Upon this account it is not a little time is spent in a Representing the several Notions there are about the methods of Uniting us to be Ineffectual, the one Party mistaking the Proposals made by the Other. But surely this is not the way to heal our breaches, or put an end to the Warm and Indecent Contests, that have been among us. For which Reason, though my principal aim is for Union, yet will not I presume on any thing proposed by us. I will only acquaint the Reader with the Nature of the Ancient Constitution of our Government in Relation to Ecclesiastical Affairs, and thereby show what will most effectually conduce to Unite us in a way the least novel, and most consistent with our Civil Establishment.

The which I can no sooner compass, but I shall be capacitated to demonstrate to the World, That the Principles of the Dissenter are very much

much adapted for concord, not only among themselves, but with the moderate Episcoparians, and very advantageous to the State in which they live.

The Ancient Constitution of our Government about Matters Ecclesiastical, is very excellently describ'd in the Necessary Doctrine, and Erudition of a Christian man compos'd by several Bishops, and other great Doctors, and approved by Authority in the days of Henry the 8th.

In this Judicious Treatise 'tis manifest, 1. That Church Government is Jure Divino. 2. That to the Constituting such a Church Government those Church Officers only are necessary who are mention'd in the New Testament.

3. That in the New Testament there is mention made of no other Church Officers, but Priests, and Deacons. That no other Government is of Divine Right, but what is under the Conduct of Bishops, or Priests, i. e. Elders; is evident; in that the New Testament mentioneth no other Governours, as Ecclesiastical; but the Bishops, or Elders; whence that Government, whose Constitution is such, as that it becomes a Government on no other account, than that the Governours are of humane make, that Government cannot, forcibly considered, be of Divine Right, 'tis but Humane, though Circa Sacra.

4. That Bishops, or Priests, the sole Governours of the Church are of One, and the same Order, their Power the same, their Work the same, which is to preach the Word, Administer Sacraments, and Enforce Discipline.

All which collect from what is asserted in the afore said Necessary Exposition about the Sacrament of Orders, where 'tis said, That Bishops, or Priests, and Deacons are the only Orders mention'd in the New Testament. And of these two ORDERS only, that is to say, Priests, and Deacons, Scripture maketh express mention. That all others were afterward added by the Church: That the Duty, and Office of the Bishop, Priest, or Elder consisteth in the Preaching and Teaching the word of God unto the people in dispensing, and Ministering the Sacraments of Christ; in Losing, and Absolving from sin, such persons as be sorry, and truly Penitent for the same, and EXCOMMUNICATING such, as BE GUILTY IN MANIFEST CRIMES, and WILL NOT BE

The Preface.

REFORMED OTHERWISE ^{and} finally, in Praying for the Whole Church of Christ, ^{and} specially for the flock committed unto 'em.

That the Order of a Bishop, or Priest, is one and the same; whose Office is, not only to Preach, and Administer Sacraments, but moreover to exercise Discipline, namely in Lying, and Allying from sin, such persons as be sorry, and truly Penitent, and in Excommunicating the Obstinately Vicious, As much as if it had been said, that Church Government, and the Office of a Bishop, or Elder, is of Divine Right.

The Office of the Deacons in the Primitive Church was partly in Ministering Meat, and Drink, and other Necessaries to the poor people found of the Church, partly also in Ministering to the Bishops, and Priests, and in doing their duty in the Church.

Hereby it appears that Deacons, as they were not by Office Preachers, nor Dispensers of the Sacraments, neither were they Governors of the Church. The Government of the Church being committed unto the Bishop, or Presbyters only. The which being so, as well as I humbly apprehend, follow, That Church Government, according to Christ's Institution, was Rated in those Particular Societies, which were under the care, and conduct of Bishops, or Elders; every such society, call'd Parochial, or Congregational, being a Complete Gospel Church, (I.e.) a Church whose Elders, or Bishops have as Exire a power for the Exercise of Discipline in their Congregations, as for the Dispensing the word or Administering the Sacraments. This is not only to be found in the Necessary Tradition, but moreover there are Intimations enough in other Discourses published in Henry the Eighth's time, to incline a Judicious mind to conclude, That the Office of a Priest, and Bishop is One, and the same; and consequently that Particular Parochial, or Congregational Churches are of Divine Institution.

I have observed in the Sum of Christianity, compos'd by Francis Lambert of Avynyon, a Treatise Published An. 1536. That the Notion of the Sameness of the Order of a Bishop, or Elder appeared in the world with some kind of boldness. For although this Lambert in his Epistle to Sebastian, Prince of Lausane, doth assert, That there be MANY Bishops of ONE City, for (saith he) every City hath so many Bishops, as it hath true Evangelists, or Preachers. For every Preacher of the Truth, &c. is a true Bishop, although he

he be not call'd fo of many; Bishops be only Prophets of Truth, and there should be so many Bishops, as the multitude of People requireth, Verily Every Parish ought to have its proper Bishop. *And in the Treatise it self, chap. 5. In every City, Town, and Village there ought to be many Bishops (i. e.) Evangelists, or Preachers, after the quantity of places, and multitude of people. If many Parishes be so great, that one Bishop is not sufficient for them, let them be divided, and to every part a Bishop assigned. This, and much more in Lambert. Notwithstanding which, this Treatise is published by Tristram Rewell, and dedicated to Queen Anne, wife of Henry the 8th. A thing that would not have been done but that this Opinion was very common at that time, and within seven years after declar'd to be the sense of the Church of England, as I have run'd out of the Necessary Erudition. But*

To That the Superiority of one Bishop over another, or of a Bishop over a Presbyter is of Humane, not of Divine Right.

Dioecesan Bishops, Metropolitans, or Patriarchal are not found in Sacred writings, and concerning this, the necessary Erudition is well express'd, in these words, And whereas we have thus summarily declar'd what is the Office, and ministration, which in Holy Scripture hath been committed to Bishops, and Priests, and in what things it consisteth as is before rehearsed, lest peradventure it might be thought to some persons, That such Authorities, Powers, and Jurisdictions as Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Metropolitans now have, or heretofore at any time have had justly, and Lawfully over other Bishops, were given them by God in holy Scripture. We think it expedient, and necessary, That all men should be advertis'd, and taught, That all such lawful Powers, and Authorities of ANY one Bishop over another, were, and be given to them, by the Consent, Ordinance, and Positive Laws of men ONELY, AND NOT BY ANY ORDINANCE OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE. And all other Power, and Authority, which any Bishop hath used, or exercised over another, which hath not been given to him by such consent, and Ordinance of Men, (as is aforesaid) is in very deed no LAW-FULL POWER, but PLAIN USURPATION AND TYRANNY. So far the Christian Erudition. From whence 'tis manifest, That according unto them, Dioecesan Episcopacy is of Humane Right only (i. e.) Any one Bishop Ruling over another Bishop, or Presbyter,

The Preface.

It is to what the Scriptures do not direct unto, and consequently 'tis not of Divine Right, neither is it any further Lawful, than according unto the Laws of the Land in which 'tis Exercis'd.

Though the Ruler of Diocesane Bishops, as 'tis Circa Sacra, may be called Ecclesiastical, yet if we consider its Origine, and Source, we shall find it to be but Civil, seated primarily in the Civil Magistracy, that 'tis of an humane make, and so far, but no farther Lawful, than as Sancti'd by the Laws of the Land. Diocesane Bishops as such are not immediately owing unto God, but unto our Civil Governours for their Being, 'tis on them their sole dependance is, and on them they rely for the Continuance of their Power. The King, Lords, and Commons assembled in Parliament can, as they see cause, make what Alterations they please in the Episcopal, or Diocesane Government, Though they cannot alter any Divine Law, yet they can change any Law that receives its Being from themselves. Though they cannot alter the Office of a Presbyter, or Bishop, which receives its Being from the Institution, or Ordinance of Jesus Christ, yet they may correct, or amend any thing in the Humane, viz. The Diocesane Constitution. They can enlarge, or narrow, any Diocess, yea pull down one, and Erect another. They can add unto, or take from the Episcopal Jurisdiction, as they judge Expedient.

That this was the sense of the Church of England in Henry the 8th. time, yea and in most ages since an Episcopal Government has been established in this Kingdome, and consequently the Ancient Constitution of our Government, is not only manifest, from what hath been already taken out of the Necessary Erudition, but from other passages, that are in that excellent treatise, and some other Considerations that I will insist on. As

First, The Power, that hath ever been acknowledged to be seated in the Kings of this Realm, concerning the exempting any particular Churches from an Episcopal Jurisdiction evinces it.

If Episcopal Jurisdiction be of Divine Right, it lies not in the power of any Prince to alter it. If every Parish Presbyter is, according to the Scriptures, an Officer inferior to some Diocesane Bishop, the exempting such a Presbyter from Episcopal Jurisdiction is out of the power of any man. 'Twas a known Rule in our Land even in the days of Popery, That no Law of man can alter, or disannul any Law of God. If then our Princes ever thought themselves to have communicated with a Power of exempting any Presbyter from Episco-

The Preface.

of Jurisdiction, 'tis evident that they took not in that Jurisdiction to be of Divine Right.

But that our Princes judg'd themselves to have such a Power, is notorious, from the many Instances that can be given of their exercising it. Whosoever consults the Learned Dr. Burnets History of the Reformation, part 1. lib. 3. will find, That Ethelbert exempted a Monastery at Canterbury with some Churches belonging unto it from the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop, and his Successors. King Ina's Charter to the Abbey of Glassebury exempts them from the Bishops Jurisdiction. The like did King Offa concerning the Monastery of St. Albans An. 793. Kenulph King of Mercia that at Abington Anno 821. and Knut, that at St. Edmundsbury An. 1020. Ten and there are several places at this very time exempt from Episcopal Jurisdiction.

Whatever our Princes in after Ages might lose as to the Exercise of their just Power, 'tis certain, that Henry 8th. reasserted it, as appears by his dismembring some Dioceses, and by his removing some Churches from one Jurisdiction to another. For this Consult Dr. Burnets History of Reformation, part 1. lib. 3. page 301. where you'll find the Complaint of the Roman party beyond the Sea concerning the Kings encroaching on the Jurisdiction of the Church, &c. to which was answered, That the Division of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction whether of Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, or Bishops was according to the Roman Law Regulated by the Emperours, Of which the Ancient Councils always approv'd. And in England when the Bishoprick of Lincoln, being judg'd of too great an extent, the Bishoprick of Ely was taken out of it, it was done only by the King, with the consent of his Clergy, and Nobles.

'Tis also evident out of Dr. Burnets Hist. of the Ref. part 1. l. 3. p. 267. That this great Prince gave out such a Commission to Bonner, and it may be to others also, as makes it most manifest, that Diocesan Bishops were not of Gods, but only of the Magistrate's Institution. Hence Bonner in his Commission from the King most gratefully acknowledges that he received it only from the Kings bounty, and must deliver it up again when it should please his Majesty to call for it, even as Justices of the Peace, &c. whose Commission is ad Pacatum. Moreover Lay-men had Ecclesiastical Dignities. The Earl of Hartford six Prebends possessed him, as the Lord Cromwell to this

was

The Preface.

was made Dean of Wells. A thing very ordinary at that time, Dr. Burnets Hist. of the Reformation, part 1. c. 1. Thus a Diocesan Episcopacy at best was judg'd but an humane Creature, owing to the Magistrats alone for it's Rise, and Conservation.

Secondly, This seems to be the sense of the Reformers in Edward the 6th. time who were under the Influence of that great Divine, and Blessed Martyr Archbishop Cranmer. In Henry 8th. days Cranmer did his Utmost for the promoting a Reformation, the which, he did withal the Speed and Prudence the Unions of the times would permit, further attempt to carry on under King Edward, and what he did, was so highly approv'd of by all, who were hearty for a Reformation, that whoever considers how Unanimous the truly Protestant Bishops were, in Concurring with this great Prelate Cranmer, cannot but incline to think, That their Principles in most things about Church Discipline were the same, (i. e.) they were for the Divine Right of Bishops or Presbyters, even when they judg'd the Superiority of a Bishop to a Presbyter to be but Humane.

That this may appear to be the sense of Cranmer, I will only beseech my Reader to compare what was done under King Edw. 6th. by this great Prelate, with his Judgment concerning a Diocesan Episcopacy under Henry the 8th.

In Henry 8th. time Cranmer in answer to that Question, Whether Bishops, or Priests were first? did assert, That the Bishops, and Priests, were at one time, and were no two things, but both One Office in the beginning of Christs Religion, That in the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a BISHOP or PRIEST, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture, for ELECTION, or APPOINTING thereto is sufficient. This was then Cranmers Judgment, and I cannot understand that he did at any time in the least vary from it, for in the Necessary Erudition, which he subscribed, there is nothing asserted, but what is either Consistent with, or an approbation of, such was the Archbishop's Opinion about these points.

In this time Cranmer was so Zealous an Asserter to the Kings Supremacy, that he seem'd to be of that Opinion, which doth now appear by the name of Brasilius, for he held, That a Bishop, or Priest by the Scripture is neither commanded, nor forbidden to Excommunicate, but, where the Laws of any Realm give him Authority to Excommunicate, there he ought to use the same,

The Preface.

same, &c. But from this he must be considered to have intended, because he subscribed the Necessary Eudition, where his access; That a part of the Rights or Business Office is according to the Scriptures to Eccommunicate, &c. as well as Teach, and Administer the Sacraments.

To all this add the Progress Grammar made under Edw. 6. in the Reformation, how far he went, and how much further he would have gone, had not the Iniquity of those times been so exceeding great, and the Reign of this worthy Prince so very short. 'Tis well known that he went so far as to tempt Dr. Heylin to conclude King Edwards death an Infelicity to the Church of England, and to provoke Queen Elizabeth to say, That they had strip the Church too much of its external Splendour and Magnificence, That 'twas requisite to make some alteration in the Articles to the end a Compliance of the Roman Catholicks might be more easie. What I have insisted on in this place appears Grammar is taken out of Dr. Burners History, and a Record in his ex M.S.S. D. Sillingfleet.

3. Such is the present Prerogative of his Majesty in Ecclesiastical as well as Civil Affairs, that the asserting the Divine Right of a Diocesan Episcopacy is inconsistent with it.

The King is the Supream Head of the Church, as well as of the State; for which Reason, he hath Power to appoint Officers to look after the management of Affairs in the One, as in the Other. But if the Diocesan Bishops depend not so much on the Prince for their Supremacy and Power in making an Authoritative Inspection into Ecclesiastical Affairs, as the Civil Magistrate; who is it that is his Majesties Commissioned Officer about Ecclesiastical affairs? Is either the Diocesan or None? But if the Diocesan is such receiver his Commission from Jesus Christs even as the Apostles did; then they are Gods Officers, and not the Kings. And if so, seeing the King doth nothing but by his Officers, that is, by such as act by a Commission received from him, the King hath in this respect lost or lost the Exercise of his Prerogative. But if they are no Kings Officers, and depend as much on the King as the Civil, then their Diocesan Episcopacy is not of Divine, but of Humane Right as well as the Civil.

We acknowledge that 'tis the sense of the Church of England when Princes are Ordain'd of God to Govern Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil Persons; and that therefore if any such Prince be appointed by the King to govern under him, Circumstances of Officers and

Funda-

fundamentally, and not formally, as may be guessed. But when we speak of the Officers of Christ in Contradistinction to the Officers of the King, we mean such, whose Authority is from God, and not from Man; though the former would willingly, as in the case of the Promission, Officers of Divine Authority, who being immediately Brethren in Christ; none, could reply, Whether we shall obey God or Man Judge ye. The Office of a Presbyter, or Congregational Bishop is so much of God, that what right soever the Magistrate may have concerning Nomination, Election, or Presentation, or Appointing of any such Ecclesiastical Ministers, his Prohibition cannot make void that Commission he hath received from Jesus Christ. But such as are Officers of the King, whether about the matters of the Lord, or about the King (i. e.) whether Circa sacra, or about Civil Affairs, 'tis in the Power of the Supreme Magistrate to give or take, by Commission, as is plain from, yea to direct to the Number of such Officers, according to their own peculiar words, and to alter and change, as the occasion of Affairs, and State of the National Constitution shall require. There must be a regard had unto the present temper, and state of the Kingdom, in which the Church is, and a suiting the Ecclesiastical Affairs so far as they may have an influence on the State, after such manner, as is most conducive to the more firm establishment of the Fundamental Constitution, and consequently Peace of the State, to which end the Civil Magistrate must still firmly adhere to that known Rule by which King Henry professed to walk, which is expressed in the necessary Exordition, viz. The Scripture doth teach, That all Christian People, as well Priests and Bishops, as all other should be obedient unto Princes, and Potestates of the World; For the Truth is, that God Constituted and Ordained the Authority of Christian Kings and Princes to be the most High, and Supreme above all other Powers, and Officers in this World, in the Regiment and Government of their People, and committed to them as unto the chief heads of their Commonwealths, the Cure and Oversight of all the People which be in their Realms, and Dominions, without any exception: and to them of Right; and by Gods Commandment, belongeth not only to prohibir Unlawfull Violence, to correct Offenders by Corporal Death, or other punishment, to conserve Moral Honesty among their Subjects, according to the Laws of their Realms, to defend Justice, and to procure the Publick Weal, and Common Peace, and Tranquillity in Ourward

and

The Prince.

And Earthly things: But Especially and Principally, to Defend the Faith of Christ, and his Religion, to conserve and maintain the true Doctrine of Christ, and all such as be true Preachers and Seters thereof, and to abolish all Abuses, Heresies and Idolatries, and to furnish with Corporal Pain, such as of malice be the occasion of the same. And Finally, to Oversee, and Cause that the said Bishops and Priests, do execute their Pastoral Office truly and faithfully, and especially in those points, which by Christ and his Apostles were given and committed unto them; and in case they shall be negligent in any part thereof, or would not diligently execute the same, to cause them to redouble and supply their lack. And if they obstinately withstand their Princes kind monition, and will not mend their Faults: then and in such case to put others in their rooms and places. And God hath also commanded the said Bishops and Priests to obey with all humble respect and Reverence both Kings, and Princes, and Governours, and all their Laws, not being contrary to the Laws of God, whatsoever they be, and that not only proper iram, but also proper Conscientiam, that is to say, not only for fear of punishment, but also for discharge of Conscience.

This the Power of the Magistrate over all Persons, is what Ecclesiastical and Civil, is according to the Ordinance of God; and that tis a Part of the Magistrates Office to Defend the Faith of Christ, to maintain the true Doctrine and the Preachers thereof, and to Abolish all Abuses, &c. the which must be done, not only by keeping to the Rule of the Gospel, but in conjunction therewith, by taking a special care, that no unnecessary thing be suffered, that in its Tendency is destructive of the Peace of the State. If the present constitution of the Government of the Church, as it is National, and of humane Right onely be in any Respects Inconsistent with the Publick Weal of the Kingdom, tis necessary, that it be altered; especially when an Alteration in some little things, may abundantly contribute unto the Lasting Peace, both of Church and State.

But if the Church Government as Diocesane or National be of Divine Right, there can be no Alteration of it, and consequently seeing the setting up any of the Kings Officers to Inspect Ecclesiastical Affairs, is an Altering the Diocesan Constitution, the Prince durst not, though encouraged by an Act of Parliament, enter on it. What is of Divine Right is Sacred, and must not be touch'd, tis dangerous to come too near

The Preface.

near that Mount. For which Reason, how mischievous soever the Ecclesiastical-National-Government, may in Process of time be unto the Civil; the Civil, not the Ecclesiastical must be Altered. That there may be an Adjusting matters in debate between the Diocesane, and the State, the State must submit unto the Diocesane. For the King according to this Hypothesis hath nothing to do with Church Affairs, which are wholly by the word of God confined to Churchmen, among whose number the King cannot be justly mention'd, neither may the King take any Cognizance of what is done among them, nor may they hold their Courts in his, but only in their own Name, or rather in Jesus Christs. A Notion so inconsistent with his Majesties just Prerogative, and the Powers of Parliaments, that as it doth destroy the Former, in like manner it doth so very much limit the Latter, as to Alter the Fundamental Constitution of our Government.

By this time I presume it may appear with some Conviction to the Reader.

1. *That a Parochial, or Congregational Church Government is, according to the Church of England, Jure Divino.*

2. *That the Diocesane, or National Government as such is Jure Humano, and for its particular Form, must be such in all ages, as our Civil Governments Judge most meet, as a Means for the Preservation of Parochial Discipline, and the great Ends of the Civil Constitution.*

These things being so, A Declaring this true Church of England Principle to be still according to the Sentiments of our Governours, will Relieve tender Consciencs among Dissenters, and sufficiently gratifie any moderate Conformist to the Ending all our Divisions, without an Embasing his Majesties Prerogative.

1. *The Establishing a Parochial, or Congregational-Church-Discipline by Law, is the great thing the Dissenters desire, and what may be done consistently with the Ancient Constitution of the Government of this Realm, to the fixing the desired Firm and lasting Union among all sorts of sound Protestants.*

These Assemblies once established, as so many Compleat Particular Churches, whose Pastors have full Power for the Administring all Ordinances, and the exercising Discipline over those who do freely and of choice submit thereunto, may notwithstanding lesser Differences, be considered as United unto one another, in that they Profess the same Faith, Preach the same Word, and Administer the same Sacraments.

The Preface:

For the Proof hereof consult the Necessary Exudition, where its said,
 "That the Unity of the Holy Church of Christ is not divided by Di-
 "stance of Place, nor by Diversity of Traditions and Ceremonies,
 "diversely observed in divers Churches, for good Order of the
 "same: And though in Traditions, Opinions, and Policies, there was
 "some Diversity among them [i.e. the Churches of Corinth of Ephese,
 "&c.] likewise as the Church of England, Spain, Italy, Pole, be
 "not separate from the Unity, but be one Church in God, notwithstanding
 "that among them, there is great distance of Place, Diversity
 "of Traditions, not in all things Unity of Opinions, Alteration in
 "Rites, Ceremonies and Ordinances, or Estimation of the same—
 "such Diversity in Opinions, and other outward Manners and
 "Customes of Policy, doth not dissolve, and break the Unity
 "which is in One God, One Faith, One Doctrine of Christ and
 "his Sacraments preserv'd and kept in these several Churches
 "without any Superiority or Prebeminence, that one Church by Gods
 "Law may, or ought to Challenge over another.

Thus Particular Parochial, or Congregational Churches may be
 United in One God, One Faith, One Doctrine of Christ and his Sa-
 craments, even where there is some difference between them in lesser
 matters. What though in one Parish there is a Liturgy, in another
 a Directory, shall this hinder Union? Don't even the Papists them-
 selves acknowledge, that the Church of England was very closely
 United, even among themselves, notwithstanding the several differ-
 ent Offices there were in use among us in the times of Popery? One
 Office after the use of Sarum, another after the use of York, of Ban-
 gor, &c. and yet all United. Moreover what more common than
 to observe many little differences in Civil Corporations, even where
 they are all United in one head. A consideration sufficient to evince
 the Union of Parochial Churches to be Possible, notwithstanding some
 Remaining Differences in Customs, &c.

In these Kingdoms there are a multitude of Particular Corpora-
 tions, and little Policies, whose Customs and modes of Government
 within themselves, are very Different. The particular Laws by
 which they are govern'd as a Particular Body Corporate are of as
 many different kinds as there are Cities, Towns, or Parishes; but yet
 All United, in that they swear Allegiance to his Majesty, and submit
 themselves to the General Laws of the Land. The different Customs,
 of different places do not in the least break the Union of the Nation.

And

The Preface.

And why may it not be so in the Church? What Reason can there be Given, why the Union of many a Civil Society or Association may be, notwithstanding the different Customes are among them, but the Union of many Particular-Parochial-Churches cannot be, unless they all agree in every little thing.

Merkinde it is as Reasonable to plead for a destroying the Particular Customes, and Charters of Burroughs, Corporations, and Cities as the only way to Union in the Civil Government, as 'tis to assert, That nothing but an Uniformity among every Parochial or Congregational Church can Unite us in the Ecclesiastical. What though there are some differences among Parochial Churches as to their Customes and modes of Worship, so long as they agree in One Faith, One Lord, One Baptism: So long as they all Profess the same Faith, Preach the same Word, Administer the same Sacraments, and submit unto the same Civil Government: So long as they all Swear Allegiance to to their Prince, and Subscribe any Test to assure the World they are sound Protestants, the which being so, what hinders a firm and lasting Union?

Certainly, This is enough to shew, that their Union, if no more, is as much as that between One City and another, One Corporation and another, and that their differences are no greater, (if so great) than those between one City and another. The which being so, An Altering the Present Laws about Conformity, and an Establishing such New ones, as shall be Judged necessary by our Governours for the defence and safety of a Parochial or Congregational Church-Discipline, as well as for the Regulating his Majesties Officers Circa Sacra, will Unite us, and put an end to that Horrid sin of Schism, that hath these many years abounded in the midst of us. Let the Dissenters be permitted to Embrace the Laws and Customes of their Fore-fathers in the Apostles days about Church-Discipline, and the Mode of Worship, and they are Relieved, the which may be done without any Injury to the Conscience of any sound Protestant of the Episcopal Perswasion. I say,

2. This cannot but satisfie any moderate Episcoparian, who may, if he please, firmly abide by those Ceremonies he now doth. He may still Read the same Prayers among such as are of his own Opinion. He may wear the same Vestments, and address himself to his Majesties Officer the Lord Bishop, as unto his Ordinary for Council and Advice. And if his Ordinary or Diocesan be an Elder (for that is left to the Supreme Magistrate to appoint) he may look on him (though in truth as such,

The Preface.

be being only the Kings Officer Circa Sacra, as a Bishop who is of an Order Superiour to that of a Presbyter, and so exercise Discipline as he Receives Encouragement from him.

If there be any entering on the Ministry, who think a Diocefane Episcopacy to be Jure Divino, and is called unto a Parish or Congregation of the same Judgement. This Candidate may (if the Kings Officer be an Elder, and of the same mind with him) apply himself unto him, as unto his Diocefane, and receive Orders from him, and do all things as now, unless our Governours Judge meet to make any Alteration as to the use of some Ceremonies. Only let none be by Law compelled to do so.

Let those that are so weak, as to think a Diocefane Episcopacy to be of Divine Right enjoy the Liberty of their Consciences, the which being attended but with the vouchsafing the like Liberty unto others, I know not why they may not be satisfied. We are not for the Pulling down Lord Bishops, nor for an Alienating Church Lands. If it seem good to our Governours to continue them, we only desire, that the Nature of their Office be declared to be no other than what it was Anciently in this Kingdom, which is, That they are meerly the Kings Creatures, That all they do must be in the Kings Name, and by vertue of a Commission receiv'd from him: That as such they are only the Kings Magistrates, that act Circa Sacra, That their work is only to see that the Bishops or Presbyters within their allotted Precincts discharge their Duty not only in leading Godly Lives, but in Preaching the word, administering the Sacraments, and exercising Discipline according to the Rule of the Gospel.

We are far from pulling down such Bishops, for we rather wish that whereas there is now one, there might be five, nor are we for the alienating Church Land any more than we are for the taking from his Majesties other Civil Officers, those Pensions are allowed them for their great services. A thing we esteem as necessary, and highly expedient as what doth not only conduce very much to the Encouragement of all sorts of Learning: the equal Administration of Justice, but as what advances the Honour and Grandeur of the State. But,

3. This doth no way Embase his Majesties Prerogative in matters Ecclesiastical, It doth rather make it the more Grand and August. His Majesty is hereby acknowledged to be the Supream Head of the Church. All Officers Circa Sacra depend as much on his Majesties Pleasure for their Places as any other Civil Officers. 'Tis in the Kings

Name

The Preface.

Name they must act, by virtue of a Commission received from him, whereas by the King is Recognized in the sole Government of the Kingdom, and hath no Competitors with him, nor is he in danger of Foreign Usurpations.

To summe up all, Let all such Particular Congregational, or Parochial Churches, that are of Divine Institution according to the sense of the Old, and most true Church of England, be by Act of Parliament declar'd to be so, and taken under the Protection of the Law, and the Dissenters are satisfied. The which (as hath been prov'd) may be done without any wrong to the consciences of the Conformists.

This is the utmost I shall propose leaving it to the Wisdom of the Nation to Regulate, and Order the Constitution so far as is National and of Humane Make, as they Judge most Expedient. The States-men know best how to alter, correct, or amend any thing in the present Frame, for which reason, Modesty doth best become Divines, who never succeed in any undertakements beyond their Sphere. If no encroachments be made on what is of Divine Institution no wrong can be done us.

I desire the Dean, and his Substitute to consider this Proposal, which is but a Revival of what was on our first leaving Rome, strenuously asserted, as the Only way to break with the Designs of the Papists about Church Discipline; From the corruptions of which did proceed all the Popes Tyrannous Usurpations. Certainly the Establishing this Notion cannot but be of extraordinary use, as it Erects a Partition Wall between the Reformation, and the Corruptions of the Roman Church, as it is adjusted for the silencing all Differences among our selves, the healing our Breaches, and the fixing a firm and lasting Union among all sound Protestants, whether Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, or meer Anabaptist.

I humbly apprehend this to be enough to evince, That the Dissenters are not such Enemies to Union as some have Asserted, nor are they for the destroying a National Church Government. They are only against Unaccountable Innovations, even such as tend to the Ruine of the Old Protestant National Church, which as such is but of Humane Institution, and in all ages must be of such a Peculiar Form, as is best suited to those great Ends, viz. Gods Glory in the Flourishing of particular Parochial, or Congregational Churches and the Peace of the State.

The Dissenters do know, that as One Particular Church is not so depend on another, as to be Accountable thereunto, when at any time she may abuse her Power, yet All are accountable unto the Magistrate of that Land in which they Live, and that such is the state of things with us, that what person soever is griev'd, either by a Presbyter or Bishop, or by any Inferiour Officer Circa Sacra, he may make his Appeal to the Supream Magistrate.

with

The Purge.

with whom all Appeals on Earth are finally Lodg'd. Whatever the Deans Substinance may assert, 'tis most undeniably true, that no Appeal can be justly made from our King unto the Pope, or any Colledge of Catholick Bishops whatsoever. That herein as our Author differs from the Church of England, we do heartily agree with her.

That the sound Protestants Party among the Sons of the Church of England do accord with the Dissenters about this great Point, is not only evident from what a Conformist hath written in the following Treatise, but from what is asserted by the Judicious Dr. Burnet in the History of the Reformation. The which I do the more cheerfully insist on, that the world may see, How the Dissenters have been misrepresented, and How clear they are from any Seditious or Fattious Principles concerning Church Discipline.

In Dr. Burnets Preface to the History of the Reformation, p. 1. for which the whole Kingdom have given the Dr. thanks: 'tis asserted, That in Henry the 8ths time, 'twas an Establish'd Principle, That every National Church is a compleat Body within it self, so that the Church of England with the Authority and Concurrence of their Head and King, might examine or Reform all Errors or Corruptions, whether in Doctrine or Worship. Moreover in the Preamble of that Act by which this Principle was fix'd, 'tis declared, That the Crown of England was Imperial, and that the Nation was a Compleat Body within it self, with a full Power to give Justice in all Cases, Spiritual, as well as Temporal. And that in the Spirituality, as there had been at all times, so there were then men of that Sufficiency and Integrity, that they might Declare and Determine all Doubts within the Kingdom, And that several Kings as Ed. 1. Edw. 3. Ric. 2. and Hen. 4. had by several Laws Preserv'd the Liberties of the Realm both Spiritual and Temporal from the Annoyance of the See of Rome, and other Foreign Potentates, Hist. Ref. p. 1. p. 127.

Furthermore, the same Judicious Author, by an Extract out of the Necessary Erudition, and out of the Kings Book de Differentia Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ Potestatis, out of Gardiners de vera Obedientia, and Bonners Prefix'd Epistle, and out of a Letter written by Stokesly Bishop of London, and Tontall Bishop of Duresin, hath made it evident that the Church in Henry 8. did not only assert the Kings Supremacy, but as a Truth in Conjunction therewith, held, That in the Primitive Church, the Bishops in their Councils made Rules for Ordering their Decrees which they only called CANONS or RULES, nor had they any Compulsive Authority, but what was deriv'd from the Civil Sanction.

A sufficient evincement that they did not believe General Councils to be by Jesus Christ made the Regent part of the Catholick Church, neither

The Preface. I

did they believe their Determinations, or Decrees, to lay any Obligation on the Conscience, unless Sanction'd by the Magistrates command.

To this Dr. Burnet speaks excellently well in his Preface to the Second Part of the Hist. Reformation. 'The Jurisdiction of Synods or Councils is founded either on the Rules of Expediency or Brotherly Correspondence, or on the force of Civil Laws; For when the Christian Belief had not the support of Law, Every Bishop taught his own Flock the best he could, and gave his Neighbours such an account of his Faith as, or soon after his Censoration, as satisfied them, and so maintain'd the Unity of the Church. The Formality of Synods grew up in the Church from the Division of the Roman Empire, and the Dignity of the several Cities, which is a thing so well known, and so plainly acknowledged by the Writers of all sides, that it were a needless Imposing on the Readers Patience to spend time to prove it. Such as would understand it more perfectly, will find it in de Marca, the late Archbishop of Paris, Bæck de Concordia Imperii & Sacerdotii, and in Blondels works, de La Primauté de l'Église, None can Imagine there is a Divine Authority in that, which sprang from such a Beginning. The Major part of Synods cannot be supposed to be in matters of Faith, so assisted from Heaven, that the lesser part must necessarily Acquiesce in their Decrees, or that the Civil powers must always measure their Laws by their Votes, especially where interest doth visibly turn the Scales, so far Dr. Burnet. The contrary unto which being asserted by the Deans Substitute, 'tis Apparent, that he doth abundantly recede from the true Church of England, not only so the Reproach of his Profession, but of the first Reformation, and grief of the sober and moderate Conformist.

This I thought necessary to suggest, that I might engage the Reader to consider with what Injustice this Author treats, not only those who dissent from the Church in some things, but the Sober Conformist also, who is a thorough Church man, by Representing us all as Enemies both to Church and State, as if the adhering unto Old Protestant Principles about Church Discipline had been the Overt Act of a Spirit Seditious and Phanatical.

Having thus so fully shewn, How easy 'tis to put an end to the mischievous Divisions, which have, for some years past, prov'd very dangerous to this Kingdome. I will not enlarge on every little thing that our Author may think deserves our Animadversions.

The Rude, and slovenly methods he hath taken to asperse his Adversaries are such as do rather evince the Feebleness of his cause, than deserve the Regard of any sober Person.

His talk about the Impossibility of Union between the Church of England, and the Dissenter, because of the many Important Differences there are among

The Preface.

our Motion, is confuted by the Present Union of the Anchours of the Ensuing Treatise, who, though they differ in little things as much as any, the One being a Confor. the other a Nonconformist; the third of a Uniting Spirit in the middle between us both; yet are we all heartily agreed in the things that would Unite us. Moreover it were easy to make it appear that the differences among the Dissenters in General about Worship and Discipline are rather Nominal than Real, and that their Union is in a manner already accomplished. The Notions we insist on in opposing the Deans Substitute are truly Protestant, such as are owned and embraced by the Famous Hooker, Dr. Field, Mr. Chilligworth and Dr. Burnet, and after a Signal manner by the Country Conformist, who hath express himself in these Sheets with Gravity and Candor. He is aware of the design of this Author as well as we, as its Tendencie is towards Rome; and is sensible, what the methods taken in the opposition some of the Clergy make against the Peaceable Dissenter, do Justifie the French in their Rogorous and most cruel Persecutions.

There is to the letter of Mr. Humfrey to me at the end, his late Paper added Entitled Materials for Union, which together with this Preface if we offer'd no more will prove the things I have said to be Feasible and alone serve to that Firm and Lasting Union, which is chiefly aim'd at in these our joint endeavours.

To conclude, The peace of the Church of England, and the Greatness of the King who is head of it, being things most desireable to every good Protestant and true Subject, we have in these Papers shewn our good will to doe something towards the advance thereof: Which being submitted to the Superior thoughts of some one who is in a higher Sphere of Ability for the cultivation of it, and of place for the representing it without prejudice to our Sovereign, we do hope it may both be well accepted by him, and take with every body else, who do truly honour the King, seek Concord, and love good men.

Sept. 16. 1681.

Stephen Lobb.

The Author not being able to attend the Press desires the Candid Reader before he peruses the ensuing Discourse to Correct these momentous Errata.

Page 11. l. 9. r. is to have a Right. p. 17. l. 14. dele them. p. 29. l. 38. for chain r. chair. p. 36. l. 37. for Catholick Colledge, r. Supream Governing Heads p. 74. before l. 18. r. Ple now consider the Deans third Argument, which is p. 76. before l. 4. r. The Deans fourth Argument, which at this time only deserves Animadversions is, our Divisions give great Advantage to the Papists, and the Dissenters by their Separation have caused the Devision. Rep. p. 11. l. 5. for the 2. r. 2d. the 1. 7. r. not. p. 78. l. 28. for Form r. Term.

A Reply to the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness, &c.

CHAP. I.

A Reply to the Reflections on the Title of the Enquiry.

SECT. I.

The Introduction. The Acts of the Enquirers pretended Immodesty Examined. The Dissenter vindicated from the Reproach of ruining King and Kingdom. The Civil War the product of Jesuitical Councils, as is confess'd by Dr. Heylin. The War begun by the Episcopal on both sides. The tendency of the Deans Defence towards Popery, as 'tis a revival of the Grotian Design.

THE Defence of the Reverend Dean of Pauls Unreasonableness of Separation, containing little in it of Argument, more than what we find in the Dean's own *Treatise*, might pass unanswered, had not the *Author*, by a fuller Discovery of the *Design* of his Party (which are but a few) made it necessary to shew to the world, whither it leads. For in this *Defence* there are hints enough given to tempt an Unprejudiced and Impartial *Reader* to fear, he hath engag'd himself too deeply in that *Design* that was seemingly but begun by the *Dean*. For which Reason I will in this, with as much modesty as the subject-matter will admit, and this *Author* will let me enjoy, shew, That as I did not *abuse* the *Dean of Pauls*, when in the *Modest and peaceable Enquiry*, I detected some of his *Mistakes*; even so, if we must pass a Judgment on the *Doctor*, answerable to the Character that is to be found of his *Substitute* in the *Defence*, 'tis apparent that they are conspiring in a *Design*, which the Learned and Conformable Clergy will give him little thanks for.

The Doctor's Substitute (as hereafter I will from his own words prove) doth sufficiently declare what his party would be at, which is a point, I'm sure, that will meet with opposition from such as are true Sons of the Church, whereby the *Controversie*, if closely followed, must cease to be between *Conformist* and *Non-conformist*; it must be between *Conformist* and *Conformist*. It looks as if there were among our Church-men some resolv'd to revive *Laud's* Design, as 'tis well known there are many others among them who highly value the *Principles* and *Temper* of that great Protestant Prelate *Abbot, Laud's* Predecessor in the See of *Canterbury*, between whom the Scuffle must at last end.

That this may with the greater Conviction be evinc'd, I will in this Reply to the Defence of the Dean, &c. confine my self to the Author's own words, as compared with what is more than suggested in the Writings of Bishop *Bramhall*, and some other Sons of the Church of *England*; the which with due clearness I shall not be able to compass, if I follow our Author in his disorderly way of Writing. For which reason I must keep to the Method I took in the *Modest and Peaceable Enquiry*, and bring what calls for my observation, into its proper place. The whole then he hath offered in Answer to the *Enquiry*, may be reduced to these Heads.

1. His Reflections on the Title of the Enquiry.

2. His Censure of the Author's Design.

3. The Defence of the Dean.

I'll begin with the First.

The Author reflects on the Title, as if the Discourse notwithstanding the specious pretences of the Title, had not been as *Modest*, nor as *Peaceable* as suggested; in doing which he spends one whole Chapter, it may be not finding matter enough in the Discourse it self to enlarge so far, as to write any thing that might deserve the name of an Answer, or countenance the Title given his *Great Book*.

I could very easily therefore, as one unconcern'd, pass by this first Chapter, if there had not been more in it than the representing me as a person who deserve not the Character of being either *Modest* or *Peaceable*. But the Overt acts of Immodesty, which are insisted on by this Author, being such as cannot but be of an ill Tendency, I must consider em.

The

The first instance of Immodesty is thus express'd, "He begins his Epistle to the Dean, with observing how industrious the Papists have been, ever since the Reformation, to ruine England and the Churches of Christ in it, which he sufficiently proves from their *Rebellions and Insurrections* in King Edward's days, the *Spanish Armado* in Queen Elizabeth's, the *Gun-Powder Treason* in King James's, &c. and the late *Hellish Conspiracy*, which was designed for the utter Extirpation of the Protestant Religion, and the universal Destruction of all the Professors thereof, whether Episcopal or Dissenter. But this modest man (saies our Author) takes no notice, That King and Kingdom, Church and State have been once ruined already by such Modest Dissenters, and may be in a fair way for it again, if we suffer our selves to be Charmed and Lulled asleep by such modest Inquirers: We are aware, Sir, what a Popish Zeal would do, and what a Faction's Zeal has done, and think our selves concern'd, as much as we can, to countermine the Designs of both. But however, I confess it was very modestly done to pass over this, that while men are zealous against Popery, they may fear no danger from any other quarter.

Rep. Whether the mentioning the *Rebellions and Insurrections of the Papists* in King Edw. the 6th days, the *Spanish Armado* in Queen Elizabeth's, the *Gunpowder-Treason* in King James's, the *Hellish Plot* of late discovered, be an extraordinary act of Immodesty, or Unpeaceableness, let any temperate man among the Church of England judge that please. Is it an Act of Immodesty to relate such notorious Truths? or of Unpeaceableness, to mention the Dangers we are in, on the account of Popish bloody Plots? This it may be is not the Crime; but what follows, which is,

This modest man (saith our Author) takes no notice, That King and Kingdom, Church and State, have been once ruin'd already by such modest Dissenters, and may be in a fair way for it again, if we suffer our selves to be Charin'd and Lull'd asleep by such Modest Inquirers.

Rep. Hereby we know what the Authour would be at; 'tis as if he had said, This *Modest Enquirer* is very immodest and quarrelsome, for not imitating the *Jesuitical Clubs*, who are, contrary to the *Act of Oblivion*, raising in old sores, calling us to

the remembrance of 41. to make us look back on the actions of Archb. Laud and his Faction, the steps they made towards Rome, the bones of contention they cast in between a Protestant Prince, and a Church of England Parliament; the Civil War begun by the Episcopal; who were Chief in each Army. 'Twas this the Enquirer indeed past over in silence, wishing with his very Soul, that the Episcopal Clergy had been either so wise or honest as to have done their utmost to have prevented those Ruins, which their own Divisions brought on these Nations. For 'tis well known to many hundreds now alive, who they were that had an Influence on those Unnatural Broils and Intestine Quarrels; and whoever will consult Mr. Baxter against Hinckley, or rather Mr. Rushworth, and Dr. Heylin, will see, That the Sons of the Church of England were on both sides the active persons concern'd in the very beginning of those Troubles. But those things the Inquirer was loath to mention; it being as Unnecessary, as Unfuitable to his Peaceable Design.

However, seeing our Author will not be satisfied, unless some notice be taken of those that once already Ruin'd King and Kingdom, &c. I will out of Dr. Heylin's Life of Laud, a good Record, at least in the sense of the Dean's Defender, shew, who they were that did it. In a perusal of which 'twill appear, That 'twas the Papists, who had a sole hand in the Plot; no Protestants; I verily believe, ever design'd what was the unhappy product of the Hellish Conspiracies of the bloody Papist. This hath been long ago discover'd by Dr. Du Moulin, and since by Dr. Oates, and here most exactly related by Dr. Heylin a Son of the Church, in these words, viz. 'A Confederacy was formed amongst them, [i. e. the 'Papists] consisting of some of the most subtle heads in the 'whole Jesuitical Party; by whom it was concluded to foment 'the Broils began in Scotland, and to heighten the Combustions 'there, that the King being drawn into a War, might give them 'the opportunity to effect their Enterprize, for sending Him and 'the Archbishop to the other World. Which being by one of 'the party on Compunction of Conscience made known to Andreas 'ab Habernsfield, who had been Chaplain, as some said, to the 'Queen of Bohemia, they both together gave intimation of it to 'Sir William Boswell, his Majesties Resident at the Hague; having 'first

first bound him by his *Oath*, not to reveal the same to any man living, but to the *Archbishop* himself, and by the *Archbishop* to the *King*. This signified by *Boswell's* Letters of the 19th of *Septemb.* together with a general draught of the Design transmitted to *Canterbury* under the hand of *Habernsfield* himself, the first Discoverer of the Plot: On the receipt of which Dispatches, the *Archbishop* giving directions to *Boswell* to proceed to a further discovery of it, sends the Intelligence with all speed imaginable, by his Letters of the 11th of the same Month, to the *King* at *York*, beseeching nothing more than his Secrecy in it, that he would not trust his Pockets with those dangerous Papers, and the business. And so far both the *King* and he had very good reason to be sensible of the Dangers which were threatened to them: But when the large Discovery was brought unto him, transmitted in *Boswell's* Letter of the 15th of *October*, he found some Names in it, which discredited the whole Relation, as well in his *Majesties* judgment, as his own. For, besides this naming of some profest *Papists*, as the *Duchess* of *Buckingham*, the *Countesses* of *Arundel* and *Newport*, *Montague*, *Digby* and *Winter*, of whose Fidelity the *King* was not willing to have any *Suspicion*, he named the *Earl* of *Arundel*, *Windbank* Principal Secretary of State, and *Porter* one of the Grooms of the Bed-chamber, whom he charged to be the *King's* utter Enemies, and such as betrayed his Secrets to the *Popes* *Nuncio* upon all occasions; all which his *Majesty* beheld as men of most approved *Loyalty* and *Affections* to him, by reason whereof no further credit being given to the Advertisement which they had from *Boswell*, the danger, so much feared at first, became more slighted and neglected, than consisted with his *Majesties* Safety, and the condition of the times, which were apt to mischief. For, though the Party, who first brake the Ice to this Intelligence, might be mistaken in the Names of some of the *Accomplices*, which were interested in the Design, whose relations unto those of the Church of *Rome* might give some ground for the mistake; yet the *Calamities*, which soon after fell upon them both, the deplorable Death of the *Archbishop* first, and his *Majesty* afterwards, declare sufficiently, That there was some greater reality in the Plot, than some were willing to believe. But it had

' it had been a *Maxime* with King James, his Father, That *Suspicion was the Sickness and Disease of a Tyrant*, which laid him open to all the subtle practices of malicious cunning. And it had been taken up by this King for an *Axiom* also, That it was better to be Deceived than to Distrust; which proved a plain and easie way to all those Misfortunes, which in the whole course of his Reign, especially for ten years last past, had been brought upon him. So far Heylin.

By this 'tis evident, That the *Papists* were the first Contrivers of all that ruine which befel the King and Kingdom, Church and State; and that the first who received any impressions from their wretched Attempts, were the *Sons of the Church*, is as evident to such as consult Baxter, Rushworth, &c. who it may be were ignorant of their Hellish Designs; though 'tis evident enough that *Land* was acquainted with them: For which reason it seems somewhat surprizing, that notwithstanding his being so fully enlightned concerning it, he still inclin'd to favour the *Papist* more than the *Puritan*; concerning which party, they had nothing but their ungrounded Surmizes to occasion any ill thoughts of 'em. For in the whole account Heylin gives of their *Essays*, I find nothing but intimations of their *Secret* actions, which 'tis like were so secret, that not one Overt Act can be given before there was an open breach between King and Parliament; at which time the *Papists* come in as *Auxiliaries* to the King, and the *Puritan* Party came in as such to the Parliament: the King remaining to the very Death a Resolved *Protestant*, which animated the *Papist* to do their utmost for his Ruine; in which after they had in part accomplished their *Devilish Design*, they strangely triumph'd. I question not but that many of the *Roman* Faction were in both Armies, in the one Openly, in the other under a Cover; and that they attempted to heighten the Division, and at length turn'd all things into Confusion. This I take to be a true account of the Transaction; but why our *Churchmen* should thus glory, as if they had no hand in it, is not easie to conjecture: Neither is it over-easie to imagine, what the reason is, that our Author should represent the *Papist* so favourably, even when his Discourse against the *Dissenters* is so In-
correct. For saith he,

We

We are aware, Sir, what a Popish Zeal would do, and what a Faction Zeal has done, &c. q. d. We are aware of what the Papists would do, not what they have done. What the Papists have done must not be mention'd, not one word of that: Not one word of their old Rebellions and Insurrections; not one word of the Gunpowder Plot; not one word of the Plot discover'd by Andreas ab Habernsfield; not one word of the Murder of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey, of the Assassination of Justice Arnold; not one word of what they have done, only what they would do. A pleasant Insinuation, as if the Papist never yet discover'd by any Overt-acts their Horrid Design, &c. 'Tis the Faction Zeal only which has done somewhat. But yet this is not to prepare the people to expect a Presbyterian Plot, when there is none among Protestants, but what is carried on by the Sons of the Church: This is not to act suivable to the Popish Designs, which were to destroy the King, after they had prepar'd the People to believe the Presbyterians were Resolv'd for it. Whether this was the Dean's Design in misrepresenting Dissenters, I could not tell; but as to your self, I must say, That whatever your Design is, if you had been hir'd by a Popish Plotter, you could not more effectually do his work for him; and that the Protestant Gentry, who mind the Substantial part of their Religion, more than an indifferent Rite, cannot but deeply resent these your Proceedings.

Is it not most obvious, that notwithstanding the loud Cries we have had of the *Faction and Seditious Principles of Dissenters*, the Dissenters have approved themselves, when under the severest Censures and Pressures of our Clergy, to be men of another Character. That notwithstanding the many *Prophetical and Historical Discourses* among our Church-men of a *Presbyterian Plot*, no such thing could be fastned on a *Protestant Dissenter*; the Design of the *Papists* being the real Destruction of hearty *Protestants*, though Sons of the Church, under the name of *Presbyterians*. Read Mr. *Dangerfield's* Discovery of that *Sham-Presbyterian Plot*, and you'll find My Lord Duke of Monmouth, the Lord President, the Lord of Essex, brought in by the *Papists* as *Presbyterian Plotters*: Although 'tis well known, that they are Sons of the Church of *England*, whose Loyalty to their Prince, and

and Firmness to the Protestant Religion, doth equalize the greatness of their Honour.

Methinks, Sir, 'tis now high time to consider, That *as* all Protestants, whether *Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational, &c.* are all in one bottom, even *so* the One cannot be ruin'd with the preservation of the Other. Ought we not then to entertain better thoughts of each other? What, shall we now quarrel with one another, even when, unless we joyn in putting our hand to the Pump, the Ship sinks, and we all must perish together? But I must not enlarge on this subject, lest I be thought too Immodest and Unpeaceable.

A Second Instance of Immodesty now succeeds; 'Twas modestly done (saith the Author) to charge the Dean with a Design of gratifying the Roman Faction, &c. And at the same time to laugh at the Jesuits and Coleman as great Fools, for designing to bring in Popery, by the Tolerating Fanaticks.

Rep. How is this that our Author treats the Dean so unmanly, as to joyn him thus with the *Jesuits* and *Coleman*! Methinks a defending the Dean should be a distinct work from a vindicating the reputation of *Jesuits*, and the Traitor *Coleman*. And why, Sir, may I not laugh at the Counsels of some *Jesuits*, without being immodest to the Doctor? Have you such venerable thoughts of these men, that a laughing at their Devices is a Crime that must not pass without Rebuke?

But the Dean is represented as a Reviler of Dissenters, and that's immodest.

Rep. What I suggested as to this, was not without great reason, as may appear from what I insisted on in the *Enquiry*; but he goes on very pleasantly, as if by *Reviling* Dissenters I meant *Confuting* Dissenters. Really Sir, if by *Reviling* Dissenters I meant a *Confuting* of them, I fear I should have wronged the Doctor and the Truth also, if I had but said there was any one *Reviling* passage in the whole Treatise; but the fixing this sense on the words, to the end you may give us an account of your admirable Faculty of Talking very little to the purpose, is an excellency wherein you seem to delight; for I'm sure you are so modest as to fasten your own, which is a foreign sense on my words, and then run on triumphantly, &c. but after so easie a manner,

manner, that it deserves not an Answer ; and therefore I'll consider the great thing.

The Doctor is brought in (you say) as one designing to *Gratify the Roman Faction.*

Rep. That I might prevent any just offence here, I was express in distinguishing between the *Deans* own intent, and tendency of his *Treatise*. Take my words in the *Enquiry*, 'I will propose the Design of the *Dr's History*, [(i. e.) of that account he had given of Dissenters, &c.] being charitably dispos'd to distinguish between the *Finis Operis*, and *Operantis* ; For though the *End* of the work it self cannot but in its tendency prove pernicious to the Protestant Religion, yet I hope the *Dr. design'd it not as such.*

But though I thought my self oblig'd to be thus civil in my thoughts of the *Reverend Dean*, I do not find any Reason to pass the same favourable Censure on you. The *Dr.* I knew wrote against the *Papists* ; but whether you have not in some *Treatises* formerly done as much in some respects for 'em, is best known to your self. Whatever you have done either for or against the *Papist* formerly, by what I find in your *Defence* of the *Dean*, I do very much suspect you. 'Tis very evident, you have in your *Notions* about the *Nature* of an *Universal Church*, the *Notion* of *Schism*, &c. fallen in with those that were not ashamed to own, that they were for a going towards *Rome*, in order to an accommodating the Differences between the *Church* of *England*, and the *Papist*.

That this may appear to be so, I will faithfully set down your notion of these things, and then compare it with the Design of *Archb. Laud* and *Archb. Bramhall*, and leave it to the judgment of the Candid and Impartial Reader, whether you are not of those who ran the *Cassandrian way*. You say,

§ 1. That the *Catholic Church* consists of such Particular Churches, as have all the Essentials of a Church, as to Faith, Government, and Discipline. It consists of all these, as Similar parts, which have the same Nature, and make up one Body by a common Union. This p. 139, 140.

§ 2. That the *Catholic Church*, though it consists of all Particular Churches contained in it, yet 'tis not a meer arbitrary combination and confederacy of particular Churches ; but is

C

the

the Root and Fountain of Unity, and in order of nature antecedent to particular Churches, as the Sun is before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches. So that all Particular Churches received their denomination of *Catholique Church* from the *Catholique Church*, p. 144, &c.

Here you assert, That the *Universal Church* is in order of nature antecedent to Particular Churches, as the Sun is before its Beams, and the Root before its Branches, &c. But your Allusion is not *ad rem*; for you should have given us some instance of some one Universal, that was in order of nature antecedent to its Particulars, which is impossible; it being, in the sense of most, evident, That *Universale* is *unum in multis*, that is, in many particulars; which Universal hath no real Existence, but in Particulars; for abstracted from all Particulars, 'tis only an *Ens rationis*, having its being in the *Europian Commonwealth*; whence we distinguish between the consideration of an *Universal* as *Formal*, and as *Fundamental*. *Fundamentally*, and 'tis *quid singulare*; but *Formally*, and so 'tis abstracted from all Singulars; the Particulars being the foundation of the Universal, the Root from which the Universal doth proceed. Now if it be the Particulars that are the foundation of the Universal, How can the Universal be the Root of the Particulars? This is the more remarkable in our Author, because he falls in with an old exploded part of *Independency*, viz. That what person soever is not a Member of a Particular Church, is not so of the Universal Church. Which being so, I would fain know Where this Universal Church should be, when Antecedent to any Particular Church? If he had said, That by a Particular Church, he meant only such as were Organiz'd and fall into some compleat order; and that there were many, who not having arriv'd to that degree of being compleat Church-members of any Particular Church, who yet were Members of the Church Universal; he would have had ground for his Assertion; for there must be Particular Christians before Particular Churches: but to adhere to his *Hypothesis*, which seems to be but a step to the asserting *Diocesan Churches* to be in order of nature antecedent to particular Congregations, is ridiculous; especially seeing he asserts, That the Universal Church is an *Organiz'd*, or *Political Body*, the *αὐτὸν δακτύλον* of all Instituted Worship and

and Discipline; as if there could be Church-Members under Government, antecedent to the being of Particular Churches, even when no one that is not a Member of a Particular Church, is a Member of the Universal: As if a City that consists of many particular Houses were in order of nature antecedent to every particular House.

§ 3. That the *Unity* of the *Christian Church* consists in one *Communion*. *Catholique Unity* signifies *Catholique Communion*. To have a Right to be a Member of the *Christian Church*, to communicate in all the several Duties and Offices of Religion with all Christians all the World over, and to partake in all the Privileges of Christians, and to be admitted to the freedom of their conversation, to eat, and drink, and discourse, and trade together. So that such as are not Church-Members have no right to trade among Christians; A pleasant Insinuation!

§ 4. The *Unity of the Christian Sacraments*, viz. *Baptism* and *the Lords-Supper*, prove the *Unity of Christian Communion*. This is from p. 193. to p. 208.

§ 5. *Unity of Church-Power and Government*, doth also prove the *Unity of Christian Communion*. Under this head he maintains;

1. That every *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*, by his Ordination is made a Minister of the *Catholique Church*; though for the better edification of the Church, the exercise of his Office is more peculiarly confin'd to some particular place.

2. Every *Bishop* and *Presbyter* receives into the *Catholique Church* by *Baptism*, and shuts out of the *Catholique Church* by *Excommunication*.

3. That the *Catholique Church* is united and coupled by the cement of *Bishops*, who stick close together; for which you produce *Cyprian*.

4. That the *Unity and Peace* of the *Episcopacy* is maintained by their governing their Churches by *mutual Consent*. Whence you mention the *Collegium Episcopale*, the *Episcopal Colledge*, which I take to be a *Council of Bishops*, which Bishops have an Original Right and Power in relation to the whole Church, (i. e.) the foreign Bishops, as those of *Alexandria* and *Rome*, &c. have an Original Power and Right in relation to the whole Church,

even a Right and Power in relation to England.

5. That every part of the *Universal Church* is under the Government of the *Universal Bishops* assembled in their Colledge, or in Council; and what Bishop soever abuse his Power, he shall be accountable to those assembled in Council.

6. That there is no such thing as the *Independency of Bishops*, their *Independency* being almost as inconsistent with Ecclesiastical Unity, as the *Independency* of single Congregations. Whence the *Church of England*, called either *Archi-Episcopal*, *National*, or *Patriarchal*, is not *Independent*, but accountable unto *Foreign Bishops*, if at any time they abuse their Power.

7. That this Council of *Forreign Bishops*, unto which they are accountable, must look on the Bishop of *Rome* as their *Primate*; the *Primacy* of the Bishop of *Rome* being acknowledged, it seems, by our Author himself, as well as by *Bramhall*. The *Primacy* (he saith) out of *Cyprian*, being given to *Peter*, that it might appear, that the *Church of Christ* was *One*; and the *Chair*, that is, the *Apostolical Office and Power*, is *One*. Thus *Cyprian*, on whom lay all the care of the Churches, dispatches *Letters to Rome*, from whence they were sent through all the *Catholique Churches*. All this is to be found from p. 208 to the end of the Chapter. Thus you agree with *Bramhall*, though you express not the Notion so well as he doth, and should learn it better.

Before I proceed therefore, I cannot but desire you to consider what is become of your *Protestant Episcopacy*; I beseech you, Sir, consider, Is the *French Episcopacy*, a *Protestant Episcopacy*? If not, seeing the *English Episcopacy*, as described by you, is the same with the *French*, Why call you the one a *Papish*, and the other a *Protestant Episcopacy*? Whether you agree not in these respects with the *Papists*, let the world judge.

But you go on to assert,

6. That to be in Communion with any Church, is to be a Member of it, every Member having equal Right, and equal Obligation to all parts of *Christian Communion*, even that Communion which is *External and Visible*, p. 132, &c.

7. All Christians being bound to communicate with that part of the *Catholique Church* wherein they live, are guilty of *Schism*,

Schism, if they separate; whoever separate from such particular Churches as are members of the *Catholic Church*, do separate from the *Universal Catholic Church*, which is *Schism*. For to divide from any part of the *Catholic Church*, is to break *Catholic communion*, i. e. to be a *Schismatick*. Whence 'tis concluded, 1. That *Schism* is a separating from the *Catholic Church*, which notion taken singly, will stand the Dissenters and all true Christians who must be acknowledged to be members of the *Catholic Church*, in great stead, freeing them from the odious sin of *Schism*. The Dissenters divide not themselves from the communion of the *Universal Church*, Ergo, not *Schismaticks*. But the mischief is, that as this notion of *Schism* which our Author adheres unto, is the same with that of the *Papists*, as is to be seen in *Filiucius*, *Azorius*, &c. but in an especial manner in *Charity maintain'd by Catholics*; even so he closes with the same Popish Faction, in asserting,

2. That separating from the *Church of England* is a separating from the *Catholic Church*, as if the *Catholic Church* had been as much confin'd within the bounds of the *Church of England*, as the *Papists* say within the limits of *Rome*. Whence whoever separates from the *Church of England*, cuts himself from the *Catholic Church*, puts himself out of a state of salvation; He is *extra Ecclesiam, extra quam nulla salus*; they are all, while *Schismaticks*, in a state of damnation. But surely if these men believed so much, methinks they should not be at rest until all their unscriptural impositions were removed, unless they have greater kindness for such trifles, than they have for such immortal souls for whom Christ dyed.

By this Doctrine we may understand why 'tis that some of our Clergy shew greater tenderness towards *Drunkards*, *Swearers*, *Papists*, than towards poor Dissenters: The former may hold communion with the *Church of England*, and consequently with the *Catholic Church*; when the others are undoubtedly in a state of damnation; as if we were all in the same state with *Heretics*.

I'll not (as easily I might) now enlarge, in shewing the weakness which the Dean's Substitute hath discovered in the management of this *Grorian* or *Cassandrian* Design; but only tell him, That if he had consulted that excellent Treatise *The Grorian Religion discovered*, by Mr. Baxter, he might have seen an un-

answer.

answerable confutation of a great part of his Book; or if he had rather applied himself unto that great Prelate Bishop Bramball, a man of extraordinary worth for his Learning, he might have better digested his Notion: For there he would have been furnished with such distinctions about *Communion*, that would have been for his purpose and rectification. In his Defence of the Church of England, Tom. 2. Disp. 2. c. 2. he saith, *The Communion of the Christian Catholick Church, is partly internal, partly external.* Among many other things, in discoursing of internal communion, 'tis added, That it is to judg charitably one of another. To exclude none from the Catholick Communion and hope of salvation, either Eastern, or Western, or Southern, or Northern Christians, which profess the ancient Faith of the Apostles and primitive Fathers, established in the first General Councils, and comprehended in the Apostolick, Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. This granted by our Author, as describ'd by Bramball, seeing the Faith contain'd in these Creeds is profess'd by the Dissenters, 'tis queried, Whether or no this Gentleman doth not fall short in this respect of Catholick internal communion, by excluding the Dissenters from the Catholick communion and hope of salvation? Moreover as to external communion, says Bramball, There are degrees of exclusion; every one that is excluded, is not cut off from the Catholick Church; for external communion may sometimes be suspended more or less, by the just censures of the Church *claque non errante*, as in the primitive times some were excluded *a cætu participantium*, only from the use of the Sacraments; others *a cætu procumbentium*, from Sacraments and Prayers also; and others *a cætu Audientium*, from Sacraments, Prayers, and Sermons; and others *a cætu Fidecium*, from the society of Christians, yea and as it may be suspended, it may be waved, or withdrawn by particular Churches or persons, from their Neighbour Churches, or Christians, in their Innovations or Errors. Nor is there so strict and perpetual an adherence required to a particular Church, as to the universal Church. This surely is enough to intimate how sudden our Authors thoughts were: for had he but deliberated on those things as this great Bishop did, he would not assert so confidently, That the separating from a particular Church that is in the Universal, is a separating from the Universal.

Leaving therefore our Author to receive further light from this Bishop concerning his own notion; I'll make my address to the Reader

Reader, beseeching him to apply himself to our Protestant Divines for an answer to what is said against the dependency of the Church of England on Foreign Churches, such as Rome, &c. And as to what he saith concerning *Schism* from the Universal Church, which p. 276. saith he, is *when any shall separate from that part of the Catholick Church where they dwell, and set up any distinct Churches meerly for some greater degree of purity.* This is so like what the Author of *Charity* maintain'd by Catholicks, insisted on, that the Memorandums given by the famous Mr. Chillingworth, will be sufficient to enable an ordinary capacity to answer the whole he hath asserted about *Schism*.

1. That not every separation, but a causeless separation from the eternal communion of any Church, is the sin of *Schism*:

2. That imposing upon men under pain of Excommunication, a necessity of professing known errors, and practising known corruptions, is a sufficient and necessary cause of separation; and that this is the cause which Protestants alledg to justify their separation from the Church of Rome. To which I must add, That this is the cause which Dissenters alledg to justify their separation from the Church of England, it being uncontrollably true, That the professing known errors, and the practising known corruptions, is imposed on Dissenters on pain of Excommunication, as hath been proved in Mr. Baxter's first Plea for Peace, never answered, but only nibbled at by some inconsiderate Scriblers. The Dissenters are convinc'd in conscience, that if they continued in your communion, they should sin against God. What can be offered against this, I know not, unless you'll say unto us thus, viz. If this joint pretence of conscience may serve, what *Schismatick* in the Church, what popular seditious brain in a Kingdom, may not alledg the dictamen of conscience to free themselves from *Schism* or *Sedition*? No man wishes them to do any thing against their consciences; but we say that they may and ought to rectifie and depose such a conscience, which is easie for them to do. This is what hath been frequently urg'd by the Clergy, yea by the Dean of *Pauls*. But seeing these words are taken out of the mouth of a *Papist*, the answer shall be no other than what I find in the mouth of a son of the Church, the famous Chillingworth, who asserts, That whoever is convinced in conscience, that the Church of Rome errs, cannot with a good conscience but forsake her in the profession and practice of her errors; and the reason hereof is manifest, because otherwise he must profess what he believeth.

believes not, and practice what he approves not; which is no more than your self in these divers times, affirmed. For in one place you say, 'tis unlawful to speak any the least untruth. Now he that professes your Religion, and believes it not, what else doth he but live in a perpetual lye? Again, in another, you have called them that profess one thing, and believe another, a damned crew of dissembling Sycophants. And therefore in inveighing against Protestants for forsaking the profession of those Errors, the belief whereof they had already forsaken, what do you but rail at them for not being a damned crew of Sycophants? [The same may be said as to the Dissenters who are in conscience convinced, that they must profess to believe what really they do not, should they conform]. But as to what the wicked may pretend as to conscience, take the Author's answer: 'Tis said that a pretence of conscience will not serve to justify separation from being Schismatical; which is true, but little to the purpose, (saith Mr. Chil.) seeing it was but an erroneous persuasion, much less an hypocritical pretence, but a true and well grounded conviction of conscience. And therefore though seditious men in the Church and State, may pretend conscience for a cloak of their Rebellion; yet this I hope hinders not but, that an honest man ought to obey his rightly informed conscience, rather than the unjust command of his Tyrannous Superiors. Otherwise with what colour can you defend either your own refusing the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy? I may add, Otherwise with what colour can the Dean and his Substitute defend their so firmly adhering to the present Constitution?

But to return to the third Memorandum.

3. That to leave the Church, and to leave the external communion of the Church at least, as Dr. Potter understands the words (and I think I may safely add, as every Protestant but a Gracian understands) is not the same thing. That being done by ceasing to be a member of it, by ceasing to have those requisites which constitute a man a member of it, as Faith and Obedience; This by refusing to communicate with any Church in her Liturgies and publick Worship of God. This little Armour, if it be rightly placed, I am persuaded will repel all those batteries which you threaten shall be so furious. To use the words of Mr. Chil. And for this reason I will now shew the Reader,

That the Model the Deans Substitute hath given us, is what is not only in it self admirably adjusted to accommodate the difference

ferences between one Faction of the *Church* of *England*, and the *Church* [not the Court] of *Rome*, for that is their Distinction; but moreover 'tis very like that of Archb. *Laud*, for which he was censur'd as a Favourer of *Popery*.

This I will attempt to perform, by giving you an account of the Charge that was brought in against *Laud* in the House of Commons by the Lord *Faulkland*, a true Son of the *Church*; and the Reply is made thereunto by Dr. *Heylin*, whereby 'twill appear, that as there is an agreement between *Laud's* Design and our *Authors*, even so *this* as well as *that* was to 'bring' the *Church* of *Rome* and *England* together.

§ 1. Take My Lord *Faulkland's* Speech made in the House of Commons, as represented by Dr. *Heylin* in the Life of Archbishop *Laud*, p. 383. 'A little search (saith he) will find them to have been the Destruction of *Unity*, under pretence of *Uniformity*; To have brought in *Superstition* and *Scandal*, under titles of *Reverence* and *Decency*; to have defiled our *Church*, by adorning our *Churches*; to have slackned the strictness of that Union which was formerly between us and those of our Religion beyond the Seas, an Action as unpolitick as ungodly: Or we shall find them to have resembled the Dog in the Manger, to have neither Preached themselves; nor suffered those that would; to have brought in Catechising, only to thrust out Preaching; and cried down *Lecturers* by the names of *Factions*, either because their Industry in that Duty appeared a reproof to their neglect of it; or with intention to have brought in Darkness, that they might the easier sow their Tares while it was Night: And by that introduction of *Ignorance*, introduce the better that Religion, which accounts it the Mother of Devotion. In which (saith he) they have abused his Majesty, as well as his people; For when he had with great wisdom silenced on both parts those Opinions, which have often tormented the *Church*, and have and always will trouble the *Schools*, they made use of this Declaration to tye up one side, and to let the other loose: Whereas they ought either in discretion to have been equally restrained, or in Justice to have been equally tolerated. And 'tis observable, that the party to which they gave this Licence, was that, whose Doctrine, though it was not contrary to Law, was contrary to Custom; and for a long time in this Kingdom was no oftner Preached,

D

than

than recanted, &c. We find them introducing such Doctrines, as admitting them to be true, the truth could not recompence the Scandal; or such as were so far false, as Sir Thomas Moore says of the Casuists, their business was not to keep men from sinning, but to inform them, *Quam prope ad peccatum sine peccato liceat accedere*. So it seemed their work was to try, how much of a Papist might be brought in without Popery; and to destroy as much of the Gospel, without bringing themselves into danger of being destroyed by Law. To go yet further, some of them have so industriously laboured to deduce themselves from Rome, that they have given great suspicion that in Gratitude they desire to return thither, or at least to meet it half way; Some have evidently laboured to bring in an English, though not a Roman Popery. I mean, not only the outside and dress of it, but equally absolute, a blind dependence of the People upon the Clergy, and of the Clergy upon themselves: And have opposed the Papacy beyond the Seas, that they might settle one beyond the Water.

§ 2. I'll now proceed to the Reply Dr. Heylin makes to this Speech of the Lord Faulkland.

¶ 1. He produces the several Protestations of the Archbishop made in the Star-chamber, [p. 389, 390, &c.] and at his Trial before the Lords, and on the Scaffold just before his going out of this world, of his Innocency as to this. Besides, Dr. Heylin doth insist on his Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, the enlarging that Conference as an Argument that the Archbishop was no Papist.

¶ 2. Touching the Design of working a Reconciliation between us and Rome, 'tis acknowledged by Heylin, and the Design applauded. Take his own words, 'I thought when our Saviour said *Beni Pacifici*, it had been sufficient warrant to any man to endeavour Peace, to build up the Breaches in the Church, and to make Jerusalem like a City, which is at Unity in it self, especially where it may be done not only *Salva Charitate*, without breach of Charity; but *Salva Fide* too, without wrong to Faith. The greatest part of the Controversies between us and the Church of Rome not being in the Fundamentals, or in any Essential point in the Christian Religion, I cannot but look upon it as a most pious work, to endeavour an Attenuation in the Superstructures. So far Heylin goes to shew both the Lawfulness of the endeavours of a Reconciliation, and then the Possibility

of.

of obtaining of it. The which Dr. *Heylin* no sooner evinces, but he admits that such a *Reconciliation* was *endeavoured* betwixt the *Agents* for both Churches, and gives an hint upon what terms the Agreement was to have been made, and how far they proceeded on it.

3. 'As to Reconciliation (saith he out of a Book entituled the *Pope's Nuncio*, affirmed to have been written by a *Venetian Ambassador*, at his being in *England*) between the Churches of *England* and *Rome*, there were made some General Propositions and Overtures by the *Archbishops Agents*; they assuring, that his *Grace* was *very much disposed thereunto*: And that if it was not accomplish'd in his Life-time, it would prove a work of more difficulty after his Death. That in very truth, for the last three years the *Archbishop* had introduced some *Innovations*, *approaching near the Rites and Forms of Rome*: That the *Bishop of Chichester*, a great Confident of his *Grace*, the Lord Treasurer, and eight other *Bishops* of his *Grace's* party, did most passionately desire a *Reconciliation* with the Church of *Rome*; that they did day by day recede from their antient Tenents, to accommodate with the Church of *Rome*; that therefore the *Pope* ought on his part to make some steps to meet them, and the Court of *Rome* remit something of its Rigour in Doctrine, or otherwise no accord will be. The Composition on both sides was in so good a forwardness before *Panzany* left the Kingdom, that the *Archbishop* and *Bishop of Chichester* had often said, That there were but two sorts of people likely to impede and hinder the Reconciliation; to wit, the *Puritans* amongst the *Protestants*, and the *Jesuits* amongst the *Catholiques*.

Let us next see the judgment and relation of another Author, in a Gloss or Comment on the former, entituled *The English Pope*, Printed at *London* in the same Year, 1643, and he will tell us, That after *Con* had undertook the managing of the Affairs, matters began to grow to some Agreement. The King Required, saith he, such a Dispensation from the then *Pope*, as that his *Catholique* Subjects might resort to the *Protestant* Churches, and to take the Oaths of Supremacy and Fidelity; and that the *Pope's* Jurisdiction here should be declared to be but of *Humane Right*. And so far had the *Pope* consented, that whatever did concern the King therein, should have been really performed, so far as other *Catholick Princes* usually enjoy and expect

expect as their due: And so far as the Bishops were to be Independent both from King and Pope, there was no fear of breach on the Pope's part. So that upon the point, the Pope was to content himself amongst us in England with a Priority, instead of a Superiority over other Bishops; and with a Primacy instead of a Supremacy in these Parts of Christendom, which I conceive no man of Learning and Sobriety would have grudged to grant him. It was also condescended to in the name of the Pope, that Marriage might be permitted to Priests; that the Communion might be administered *sub utraque specie*; and that the Liturgy might be officiated in the English Tongue. And though the Author adds not long after, that it was to be suspected, That so far as the Inferiour Clergy and the People were concerned, the after performance was to be left to the Popes discretion; yet this was but his own Suspicion, without ground at all. And to obtain a Reconciliation upon these advantages, the Archbishop had all the reason in the world to do as he did, in ordering the Lords-Table to be placed where the Altar stood, and making the accustomed Reverence in all approaches towards it, and access to it: In beautifying and adorning Churches, and celebrating the Divine Service with all due Solemnities; in taking care that all offensive and exasperating passages should be expunged out of such Books as were brought to the Press; and for reducing the extravagancy of some Opinions to an even temper. His Majesty had the like Reason also for Tolerating lawful Recreations on Sundays and Holydays.

But the Doctor goes on, 'If you would know how far they had proceeded towards this happy Reconciliation, the Popes Nuncio will assure us thus, That the Universities, Bishops, and Divines of this Realm, did daily embrace Catholick Opinions, though they profess'd not so much with Pen, or Mouth, for fear of the Puritans. For example; They hold that the Church of Rome is a true Church; That the Pope is Superiour to all Bishops; That to him it appertains to call General Councils; That 'tis lawful to pray for the Souls of the departed; That Altars ought to be erected of Stone: In sum, That they believe all that is taught by the Church, but not by the Court of Rome. Another of their Authors tells us, (as was elsewhere noted) That those amongst us of greatest Worth, Learning, and Authority, began to love Temper and Moderation: That their Doctrines began to be altered

tered in many things, for which their Progenitors forsook the
 'Visible Church of Christ; As for example, *The Pope not Anti-*
christ, Prayers for the Dead, Limbus Patrum, Pictures; That the
Church hath Authority in determining Controversies of Faith, and
 'to interpret Scriptures about Free-will, Predestination, Uni-
 'versal Grace; That all our Works are not Sins, Merit of good
 'Works, Inherent Justice, Faith alone doth justify, Charity to
 'be prefer'd before Knowledge, the Authority of Traditions,
 'Commandments possible to be kept: That in Exposition of the
 'Scripture, they are by Canon bound to follow the Fathers;
 'And that the once fearful names of *Priests and Altars* are used
 'willingly in their Talk and Writings. In which compliances, so
 'far forth as they speak the Truth, saies *Heylin*, (for in some
 'points, through the Ignorance of the One and the Malice of
 'the Other, they are much mistaken) there is scarce any thing
 'which may not very well consist with the established (though for a
 'time discontinued) Doctrine of the Church of *England*. The
 'Articles whereof, as the same *Jesuit* hath observed, seem pa-
 'tient, or ambitious rather of some sense wherein they may seem
 'Catholick. And such a sense is put upon them by him that
 calls himself *Franciscus à Sancta Clara*, as before was said. So
 far *Heylin*.

Thus to carry on this *Reconciling Design*, all the care imagi-
 nable must be taken to humour the *Papist*, not only by prose-
 cuting the *Puritan* with the greatest severity; but the Pope must
 not any longer be stigmatized with the name of *Antichrist*; all
 exasperating passages in any Book brought to the Press, must be
 expung'd, not one word of the *Gunpowder-Treason*; for said *Ba-*
ker the Bishop of *London's* chaplain, We are not now so angry
 with the *Papists*, as we were twenty years ago; and that there was
 no need to exasperate them; and therefore the Book concern-
 ing the *Gunpowder-Treason*, must by no means be reprinted; the
Divine Service must be in some respects altered; that whereas
 the *Reformers* in *Queen Elizabeth's* time had a greater kindness
 for the Pope than those in *H. 8.* and *Ed. 6.* manifested by ex-
 punging a clause against the Pope, viz. *From the tyranny of the*
Bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities, Good Lord deli-
ver us. Even so in imitation, Archbishop *Laud* changes some phra-
 ses in the Book of *Prayers for the fifth of November*. So far a
 Church of *England* Dr. To which I might add several other in-
 stances,

stances, but I wish there had not been the woful occasion of insisting on so much.

By this time the Reader may see cause to suspect at least the *Deans Substitute*, who in the Defence of the Dr. gives us the scheme of the old *Grotian model*, so much esteemed by the Archbishop *Laud*, who in his walking towards *Rome*, kept most exactly thereunto.

But notwithstanding this, caution must be had, that we reproach not all the Church of *England* as if they had been such as this Author; for I do verily believe there are very few this day in *England* among the Conforming Clergy, who will approve of this mans notion, but probably may judg themselves as much concerned to oppose it, as any among the Dissenters. I'm sure *Abbot* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Usher* Primate of *Ireland*, were persons of quite another principle and *semper*.

And not only *Abbot* and *Usher*, but if we may judg of a *Queen Elizabeth Protestant* by the Writings of the famous *Hooker* and *Dr. Field*, we may be sure that this man (to say nothing of the *Dean*) hath (notwithstanding the great talk of the glory of the first Reformation) forsaken the notion the old church of *England* had of the church, and of such as are judged *Schismatical*, falling in with the *French Papacy* about Church-Government, as I will evince in the next Section.

S E C T. II.

The Deans Substitutes agreement with the Papists about Schism, even when he differs from the Church of England, detected. His notion about the Government of the Catholick Church the same with that of the French Papist.

THAT our Author entertains notions about the nature of the *Visible Church*, and of the *Schismatical*, very different from what the old *Queen Elizabeth Protestants* did, will appear with the greatest conviction to such as will but consult the famous *Mr. Hooker* and *Dr. Field*, who do most expressly contradict what is asserted in the *Dean's Defence*.

The

The Dean's Defender doth extremely insist on the *Unity* of the Universal Church, as what doth consist in more than in the *Unity* of the Faith, though in combination of those other graces of *Love*, and *Charity*, and *Peace*, to wit, in an external communion, Take his own words in answer to a supposed objection.

P. 183. *But though Faith alone is not sufficient to Christian Unity, yet Faith in combination with those other graces of Love, and Charity, and Peace, make a firm and lasting union. This I readily grant (saith he); but yet must add this one thing, That Christian love, and charity, and peace, in the language of the New Testament, and of the ancient Fathers, when they signify Christian Unity, signify also one communion, that is, the unity of a Body and Society which is external and visible; and doth not only signify the union of souls and affections, but the union of an external and visible communion.*

P. 184. By the union of an external and visible communion, he means the living in Christian communion and fellowship with each other; that is, a worshipping God together after one and the same external and visible manner.

P. 248. Moreover he adds, That such as separate themselves from the external communion of any particular Church that is part of the Universal, do separate themselves from the Universal visible Church. All Schismatics, in his opinion, cut themselves off from the visible Catholick Church, even as all such as are excommunicated, are cut off.

This is the notion of the Deans Substitute, which is as agreeable to the sense of the Papists, as 'tis in it self grossly absurd, and different from the doctrine of sound Church of England Protestants.

That 'tis agreeable to the sense of the Papists, you'll find in a Conference between Dr. Peter Gunning, and Dr. Pierson, with two Disputants of the Romish Profession. All Schismatics (say the Romish Disputants) are out of the Church, and quite separate from it, as a part cut off is separate from the body. Schismatick is a term contradistinct to Catholick. No Schismatics can be true members of the Catholick church; for Schism, as they define it, is a voluntary separation of one part from the whole true visible church of Christ. The correspondency that there is between the Author of the Deans Defence, and those Papists, about the formal reason of Schism, is as much as if the Defender had fetcht his Definition

tion of *Schism* out of their Writings ; which notion, as embrac'd by one that professes himself a *Protestant*, is as grossly absurd, as 'tis contrary unto *Protestant principles*.

I say, such a notion entertain'd by a professed Protestant, is grossly absurd ; for it exposeth him to the triumph of the *Roman-catholicks*, it being impossible that the *Papists*, notwithstanding their *Schismatical* Impositions, should be esteemed *Schismatical* by our Author. For all such as are *Schismatical*, are (saith he) cut off from the visible Catholick Church, of which the Church of *Rome* is acknowledged to be a true part, although from it these men, as they are Protestants, separate, and so cut themselves off from the Catholick visible Church ; for such as separate from any true part of the Catholick church, according unto him, do cut themselves off from the Catholick church, and are *Schismatics*.

Take a view then of the admirable abilities of our *Author*, who must be considered to assert, either that the Church of *Rome* is *Schismatical*, or not. If not *Schismatical*, the church of *England* must be so, or otherwise there may be a separation from the external communion of a particular Church that is a part of the Universal, without being guilty of *Schism* or of separating from the Catholick church. But if the Church of *Rome* be *Schismatical*, 'tis either cut off from the visible Catholick church, or not ; if not, then *Schism* consists not in a separating from the visible Catholick church ; that is, a man may be a *Schismatick*, and yet a member of the catholick church, a thing that our Author denies. But if the church of *Rome* be cut off from the visible Catholick church, then the distressed *Papist* is in as sad a condition as the Dissenter ; he is cut off from the church of Christ, and must be either damn'd, or saved by another Name than that of Jesus Christ. If the latter, then farewell Christian Religion. If the former, Where shall we find any part of the Universal Church beside the Church of *England* ? All the *Protestants* beyond the Sea are in the same state with the Dissenter at home ; The Church of *Rome*, and all such as are in Subjection to that See, are cut off from the Visible Catholick Church, and it may be all the Eastern Churches in the World too ; that is, the Catholick Visible Church is confin'd within the Pale of the Church of *England*. Pure Prelatical *Donatism* with a witness ! Where will not Confidence, when the attendant of Ignorance, lead men. Moreover,

This

This Notion as 'tis grossly absurd, in like manner 'tis most contrary to the old Protestant Principles. Consult Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, lib. 3. and you'll find nothing more fully asserted than, *That the Visible Church of Jesus Christ is therefore One in outward Profession of those things, which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every particular Christian man.* — But we speak now of the Visible Church, whose Children are signed with this mark, One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledg them for her Children. So far Hooker. But you will, it may be, object, That such as are Schismatical, or Excommunicate, may acknowledge One Lord, hold One Faith, and receive One Baptism, And shall such be consider'd as Members of the Visible Church? Take Mr. Hooker's own words for an Answer, *If by external Profession they be Christians, then are they of the Visible Church of Christ; and Christians by external Profession are they all, whose mark of Recognizance hath in it those things which we have mentioned; yea, although they be impious Idolaters, wicked Hereticks, Persons Excommunicable, yea and cast out for notorious Improbability.*

Thus 'tis evident, that Mr. Hooker entertain'd apprehensions quite contrary to those of our Author; yea and Mr. Hooker doth consider the very Notion asserted by our Author to be Popish, which he doth as such most excellently expose. *As for the Act of Excommunication, (saith he) it neither shuts out from the Mystical, nor clean from the Visible, but only from the Fellowship with the Visible in holy Duties.* In contradiction to which the Dean's Substitute's Assertion is, p. 226. *That Excommunication casts a man out of the visible Society of Christ's Church, not of this or that particular Church only, but of the Whole Christian Church.* — He that is cast out of one Church, is thereby cast out of all, and separated from the Body of Christ, which is but One. — And therefore such are out of a state of Salvation. As if it had been said in opposition to Mr. Hooker, Such as are Excommunicate are shut out clean from the Visible Church, yea and from the Mystical Church. A Notion that Mr. Hooker considers as held by none but Papists, for he immediatly addresseth himself to the Church of Rome, thus; *With what congruity then (saith he) doth the Church of Rome deny, that her enemies whom she holds always for Hereticks, do at all appertain to the Church of Christ?* — How ex-

clude they us from being any part of the Church of Christ, under the colour and pretence of Heresie, when they cannot but grant it possible, even for him [i. e. the Pope] to be as touching his own personal persuasion Heretical, who in their opinion not only is of the Church, but holdeth the chief place of Authority over the same? The like may be said by way of Answer unto our Author. Moreover the Learned and judicious Dr. Field, Son of the Church, is as full in contradicting what is asserted by our Author. For this Dr. of the Church, discoursing about the Schismatick, says, lib. 1. c. 13. That their departure is not such, but that notwithstanding their Schisme, they are and remain parts of the Church of God. — Schismatics, notwithstanding their Separation, remain still conjoyn'd with the rest of God's people, in respect of the profession of the whole saving Truth of God, all outward acts of Religion, and Divine Worship, Power of Order, and Holy Sacraments, which they by vertue thereof administer, and so still are and remain parts of the Church of God. — The like is asserted of such as are cast out by Excommunication, c. 15.

But I'll not enlarge any further, having sufficiently evinc'd, that the Opinions of this man, who treats the Dissenters with so much scorn and contempt, are such as were antiently by Queen Elizabeths Protestants exploded as Popish; and at this very time, I verily believe, rejected by the greatest part of the Episcopal Clergy; and that the Contest now is not so much between Dissenters and the Church of England, as between a few under the name of the Church of England on the one part, and the greater number of the Church of England, with the Dissenter, on the other. The former under the notion of running down Dissenters, are preparing materials to meet the Papist: The other, to the end they may the more effectually prevent the Designs of Rome, have sent forth their Plea for the Nonconformist, finding themselves concern'd to check the Insolence of those, who in this day of common Calamity, would ruine the conscientious Protestant Dissenter.

This being so, I must beseech the Reader not to misapprehend me in what follows, as if I had been speaking reproachfully of the Church of England; because I cannot but discover, how agreeable the Sentiments of the Deans Substitute about Church-Government are, unto those embrac'd by the French Papist.

That I may the more clearly shew what are the mischievous Tendencies

Tendencies of our Author's Notion about Church-Government, I will give in short, the most distinct, and truest state of the *Controversie* I can, shewing what is granted by sound Protestants, and what not; What are the Doctrines of the Papists: How far the French and Italian Papist agree, and wherein they differ, and in what respects the Dean's Substitute concurs with the French.

§ 1. All are so far agreed as to conclude, That God hath had a Church at all times in every Age of the World. We might be very particular in considering the divers Denominations under which the Church falls, answerable to the divers capacities of the Members thereof, and the divers states in which it is and hath been, which I shall at this time pass by.

§ 2. That the Church is but One, one Body united to one Head.

§ 3. That this One Church must be considered, as the Members thereof are scattered up and down the World, &c. and as they are joyned together in particular Societies. The former is call'd the Church Universal, the other a Particular Church.

The Papists themselves do acknowledge, That the Church must be considered as Universal and as Particular; though they look'd on the Universal to be such, whose whole existence was in Particulars; as *Universale est unum in multis singularibus*; Whence it follows, That such as are not members of a Particular Church, they belong not unto the Catholick Visible Church. This very Notion hath been embrac'd by some, to wit, the Old Independents; but of late it hath been generally exploded by Divines of that name, they leaving it to entertain such as the Dean's Substitute.

§ 4. That the Church of Christ is under Government. There is such a thing as Church-Government *jure divino*.

The Papists, both French and Italian; The Protestants, whether Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, or Anabaptist, heartily agree in *This* about this.

§ 5. The great difference is concerning what that Church-Government is, which is of Divine Institution: Where 'tis seated, whether in a Particular, or in the Universal Church; and whether it be Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical, or mixt.

§ 6. The Papists, with whom the Doctor's Substitute doth agree, assert, That the Universal Church is the *apostolical* of Church-Government; That all Church-Officers belong to the

Universal Church, and have an Original Right to govern the whole Universal Church.

Take the notion as found in the Defence. *We must (saith he) consider, that all the Apostles had relation to the whole Church; and therefore, though being finite creatures they could not be every where at a time, but betook themselves to different places, and planted Churches in several Countreys, and did more peculiarly apply themselves to the government of those Churches which they themselves had planted, and ordained Bishops to succeed them in their care and charge; yet their Original Right and Power in relation to the whole Church, did still remain, which they might re-assume when they saw occasion for it; and which did oblige them to take care as far as possibly they could, that the Church of Christ suffer'd no injury by the heresie or evil practises of any of their Colleagues.* P. 212.

§ 7. The Protestants (excepting some obscure Writers) assert particular Churches to be the *proper Seat* of Church-Government; among whom there are these differences.

1. The Episcopal and Presbyterian differ from the Congregational and Anabaptistical about the extent of particular Churches, e.g. the latter concluding that their number must be no more than are capable of personal communion; the former contrarily judge, That a company of a greater extent may be included within the confines of a particular Church, who in the management of their discourses concerning it, give too great an advantage unto the Papacy.

2. The Episcopal and Presbyterian differ from some of the Congregational concerning the nature of Discipline, the Congregational being esteemed as espousers of a Democracy, or Populacy, the other against it.

3. The Episcopal differs from the Presbyterian, in that the Episcopal are for a Monarchy, the Presbyterian for an Aristocracy.

§ 8. All Protestants generally agree in asserting the Independence of particular Churches.

'Tis notorious that the Church of England established by Law, is a particular National Church, independent on any Foreign Power whatsoever. Such is the constitution of our Church, that what Bishop soever is found an abuser of his Power, he is not accountable to any Colledge of Bishops, but such as are conven'd by his
Maje.

Majesties Authority; and that what apprehensions soever he may have of his being griev'd through any undue procedure, he cannot make any *Appeal* to any *Foreign Power* from the *King*.

'Tis the *King* who is the Supreme Head of the Church of *England*; there is no Power on earth equal unto, or above *his* in *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. To appeal unto any *Foreign Power*, whether unto *one Bishop* singly, or unto *many* by consent assembled, 'tis to do what tends to the subverting the present Constitution; yea, 'tis to subvert the very foundation of our Government, as 'tis opposite unto a *French* or an *Italian Papacy*.

Whoever consults the many Laws made in *Henry the 8th's* time, *Edward the 6th's*, and *Queen Elizabeth's*, cannot but be fully satisfied that the *Appeal* of any Bishop, or any other person, from the *King* unto any other *Foreign Power*, is contrary unto the *ancient Laws* of this Realm; and that such as shall venture the doing so, run themselves into a *Præmunire*. For 'tis most apparent, that our *National Church* of *England* is a particular Independent Church. That neither the *Pope of Rome*, nor the *Bishop of Paris*, nor any other *Foreign Bishops*, have any Original Right or Power in relation to *England*; and that therefore their assuming any such power, is a sinful Usurpation. All this is undoubtedly true. Yet,

§ 9. The Deans Substitute exposeth the *Independency* of Episcopal particular Churches, as what is inconsistent with Catholic Union; and asserts, That if any Bishops abuse their Power, they are accountable unto a General Council, that is, unto a *Foreign Power*, whereby he doth his utmost to tare up the Church of *England* by the Roots, to subvert his Majesties Supremacy, as if all the Laws of the Land concerning it had not been of any force. All this by *Dr. Stillingfleet's* Defender.

That this is so, I'll evince from our Authors own words, which are as follow, *And now I cannot but wonder (saith he) to find some Learned men very zealous assertors of the Independency of Bishops, and to alledge St. Cyprians Authority for it: for what ever difficulty there may be in giving an account of every particular saying in St. Cyprian, certainly he would never be of this opinion, who asserts but One Chair, One Apostolical Office and Power, which now resides in the Bishops of the Universal Church; for when the same*
Power

Power is in ten thousand hands, it can be but One only by Unity of consent in the exercise of it; and 'tis very wild to imagine that any one of these persons who abuse this Power, shall not be accountable to the rest for it, i. e. to the Colledge of Bishops; for (saith he soon after) if we consider the practise of the ancient Church, we shall find that they never thought every Bishop to be Independent, but as liable to the censure of their Colleagues, as Presbyters and Deacons were to the censure of their Bishops. P. 212. So far our Author, who doth as it were expressly assert, That the Archbishop of Canterbury, though Metropolitan and Primate of England, if he abuses his Power, is accountable unto the General Council, when by consent assembled; that is, the Archbishop, who is not in power above any other Bishops, (as is by the Deans Substitute asserted) abusing his Power, is accountable to some Court above any in this Realm, to a General Council, a Colledge of Bishops.

§ 10. Although the Papists generally assert, That the Universal Church is the *suprema auctoritas* of all Church-Government as hath been already intimated; yet there's a difference between the French and Italian Papist about the kind of the Government; the one insisting on an Aristocracy, the other on a Monarchy, i. e. the French holds, That the *pars Regens* of the Universal Church is a General Council; the Italian, That it is one single person, viz. the Bishop of Rome.

There hath been in the Church of Rome for some hundred years, a great contest concerning the Supreme Regent part of the Universal Church, Whether it be a General Council, or the Pope, Whether a General Council be above the Pope, or the Pope above a General Council. About which the Church of Rome is fallen into three parts, as Bellarmine asserts.

1. That the Pope is the Supreme Head of the Church, and so much above a General Council, that he cannot subject himself thereto. The Government of the Universal Church, though mixt, being composed of a Democracy, Aristocracy, and Monarchy, yet principally 'tis Monarchical. The Supreme Power being immediately lodg'd in the Monarch, who is the Bishop of Rome, Christ's Vicar, and Peter's Successor, he is above a General Council, and not accountable to any on earth for any abuse he may be guilty of. Of this opinion, saith Bellarmine, are all the Schoolmen generally, especially *Santus Antonius*, *Joannes de*

Tur-

Turrecremata, Alvarus Pelagius, Dominicus Jacobatus, Cajetan, Pighius, Ferraricus, Augustinus de Ancona, Petrus de Monte, &c. Yea, this is the sense of the Jesuits generally, and of all such as are engag'd to support the Court of Rome, as are the *Italian Bishops*, for which reason I call it *Italian Popery*.

2. There are some among the *Canonists* who assert, That the Pope is above a General Council, but yet may subject himself hereunto.

3. There are others who assert, That a General Council is above the Pope, that the *Supreme Governing-power* over the whole *Catholic Church* is given them immediately; that the Pope, as every other Bishop, is accountable to the General Council.

This is what hath been asserted by the Council at *Constance*, Anno 1315. and by that of *Basil*, Anno 1431. and by many Learned Divines in the Church of *Rome*, viz. *Cardinal Cameracensis, Joannes Gerson, Jacobus Almain, Nicolas Cusanus, Panormitanus*, and his Master Cardinal *Florentinus*, as also by *Abulensis*.

Gerson being a Chancellor at *Paris*, had many followers among the French, who at this very day assert, That the *Supreme Regent part* of the *Universal Church*, is a General Council; for which reason I conclude, that such as assert, That a General Council is the *Political Head or Regent part* of the *Universal Church*, are in the number of *French Papists*.

Thus *Cassander*, yea and *Grotius*, as to Church-Government, were for a French Papacy. Whether the Dean's Substitute be or be not, I leave to the impartial censure of the judicious Reader, who is desired to consider his notion as compared with that of the *Parisians*.

I. The Dean's Substitute doth suggest, That the *Universal Church* is the first Seat of Government; 'tis a political organiz'd Body, in which there is a *Pars Imperans & Subdita*, the Bishops in their College being the Governours, or *Pars Imperans*, and all others of the *Universal Church* the *subdita part*.

It may be our Author to gratifie the Dean, will deny the *Universal Church* to be a political organiz'd body, as indeed he doth; but he even when he's resolv'd to assert, That the *Universal Church* is the Seat of Government and Discipline; as if there could be any Government in any Society, without a governing and governed parts. But it is, as a *National*, even so the *Universal*

sal church with him is not a political body, that is, 'tis not such a body unto whose constitution a *pars Imperans* and *subdita* is necessary, even when its constitution is such that it cannot be but there must be in it some Governours, and other Governed. There is not a Regent part in the Catholick Church, but there is a Governing part; that is, there are Governours, viz. the Catholick Bishops in their Colledge, who are the Governours of the Catholick church.

Thus our Learned Gentleman in one place endeavouring to fetch the Dean off from that difficulty Mr. Humphreys had driven him unto, concerning the constitutive Regent part of the church of England as National, doth say, *The Dean answers in my poor opinion, with great judgment and consideration, We deny any necessity of such a constitutive Regent part——For though a National church be one body, yet it is not such a political body as Mr. B. describes, i. e. there is no such Government as cannot be without a Pars Regens & Subdita, p. 562.* And yet he grants, That Church-Governours united and governing by consent, are the *pars Imperans*, and christian people in obedience to the Laws of our Saviour, submitting to such government, are the *pars subdita*, p. 565. All which is true (saith he) without a Constitutive Regent Head, (i. e.) There is a Governing part or a *pars Regens*; or to speak English, a Constitutive Regent part or Head, without a Constitutive Regent Head. The like is asserted of the Universal Church, namely, That it is a Church governed by the Colledge of Bishops, which Colledge of Bishops are the *Pars Imperans*, though not the constitutive Regent part. For we must allow him to wallow in his contradictions. But a Governing part there is in the Universal Church, which Governing part is compos'd of Bishops.

II. *The Governours of the Universal Church are Catholick Bishops in Council*, who though they are equals, and as such have no Superiority over one another, p. 213. yet the Colledge, or these Bishops assembled, have Authority and command over any of its colleagues; that is, every single Bishop is under the Authority and command of this Foreign Council.

III. *The Catholick Church is One*, when it is not rent and divided, but united and coupled by the cement of Bishops, who stick close together, p. 596.

The result of all is, That the Catholick Church of Christ being

ing one Visible Political Body, it is a compleatly Organiz'd body on Earth, hath its Governing and Governed parts; The Visible Governing part being a Terrestrial Numerical Head, though collective, viz. A Colledge of Bishops, a General Council.

A Notion that doth not only subvert the present constitution of the Church of England, that thinks not it self accountable to any such Forreign Power; but moreover in it self as grossly absurd, as 'tis suited to the French, the Cassandrian, or the Grotian Model, leading us all to Unite with all the other parts of the Catholick Church, by rendring an unwarrantable Obedience unto such a Governing Power as is seldom in being. and when so, as dangerous and of as destructive a tendency to the Government of Jesus Christ, as that of the Italian Papacy.

But whether our Author had a clear prospect of this Intreague, when at first he was put on it, I'll not venture to determine; it being sufficient that I have fully proved, That the New-Modd'd Episcopacy of this Gentleman is the same with that of the French; which is as inconsistent with the old-establish'd Episcopacy of our Church, as is the Italian Papacy. For if our Author may safely exceed the bounds of those Laws, that do with the greatest Severity forbid our Appeal to any Forreign Power, by addressing himself unto a Forreign Colledge, Why may not another presume to make his Appeal to the Court of Rome? What Reason can be given for the One, which will not prove cogent for the Other; especially to such, who, living where they have constant experiences of the excellency of a Monarchical Government in the State, may be easily induced to conclude Monarchy as admirable in the Church, and then farewell Impossibilities, viz. General Councils, a Roman Monarch in the Church being much more desirable.

Having thus given a true state of the Controversie, whereby we find our Author to agree exactly with the French Papist about Government, asserting the Universal Church as such, to be a Governed Body, in which there is a Governour, and the Governed; 'twill be requisite, that as I have shewn what are some of the Absurdities which flow from it, that I do moreover evince it to be in it self *unfounded* and *false*.

That this may the more clearly and with the greater conviction be performed, I will be so just, as to do our Author all the right imaginable, by taking notice what he seems to assert, and

what he's resolv'd to deny, and accordingly proceed to the strictest disquisition after the *Truth*.

Our Author asserts, *That the Universal Church*, as such; is the *Seat of Government*, 'tis a *Body under Government*; as much as if it had been said, There must be in it a *Governing*, and a *Governed* part. It being impossible that *Government* should be without *Order*, which *Order* is *secundum sub, & Supra*. Wherever there is *Government*, there must be a *Superiour* part *Governing*, and an *Inferiour* *Governed*. There must be *Dominus & Subditus*. This our Author seems to grant, when he doth to this Assertion of the Government of the *Universal Church*, add his thoughts about the *Governours* thereof; which, he saies, are the *Universal Bishops assembled in Council*.

But although this is what our Author doth assert, he doth notwithstanding resolutely deny the *Universal Church* to be a *Political Body*; what he saith of a *National*, that he asserts of the *Universal Church*, both which are *Govern'd Societies*, but neither a *Political Body*, p. 564, 565. All which is to fetch off the Dean from Mr. *Humphrey's* and Mr. *B's* unanswerable *Queries* concerning the *constitutive Regent* part of a *National church*, whose existence must be acknowledged, if a *National church* as such be a *Governed church*, or a *Body Politick*; but yet this cannot be found out. For which reason they distinguish between a *Governed Society* and a *Body Politick*; between a *Governing* and a *Regent* part, and assert, *That the National church is a Govern'd Society*, but not a *Body Politick*; that it hath a *Governing*, but not a *Regent* part; the like of an *Universal church*.

This is the true state of our Author's Judgment; wherein we have an admirable account of the Gentleman's acute distinguishing, the excellency of which I'll leave to the entertainment of his Admirers; and if he please, consider the Notion according to his own stating it: that is, to gratifie him, I won't insist on the word *Policy*, nor *Regent*, nor *constitutive Regent* part; but only on *Government*, *Governours*, and *Governed*; and so our Enquiry being about the *Government* of the *Universal Church*, we must consider what is necessary thereunto; and see whether what our Author asserts be agreeable unto such a constitution; for if not so, 'tis far from *Truth*.

To consider what it is that is necessary to the constitution of any *Governed Body*; that is, what is so necessary, that the
absence

absence thereof is destructive to the Constitution? To this I Answer,

That a *Governing*, and a *Governed* part is so necessary unto *Government*, that where either one of these be absent, there can be no Government. A Governed Body cannot be without a Governing Part, neither can this be without a part Governed. Government doth necessarily infer both these; remove either one, & the Government is destroyed. Government is a Relation resulting from that mutual respect the Governing and Governed parts have to each other, whence as *Sublato uno Relatorum tollitur & alterum*; and where there is nor Subject nor Term, (*i. e.*) nor *Relate* nor *Correlate*, there can be no *Relation*. Remove the Governing part from the Universal or National Church, and the Government ceases. Paternity may be where there is no Father, as soon as Government without a Governing part. Whence I infer, *That where there is a Fixed Government, there must be a fixed Governing part.*

This premised, Let us next enquire, whether or no what our Author asserts, be suitable to this *undoubted Rule*? Doth he shew us such a Governing part? The Government is a constant fixed Government, but where is the constant fixed Governing part? 'Tis a *General Council*, saith he, *i. e.* the universal Bishops in their Colledge assembled. But is this a fixed Governing part? Is it not evident to an ordinary capacity, that the assembling such a Council of all the Bishops in the World, is a difficulty insuperable; and that without such an Assembly, 'tis impossible they should by joyn't consent govern the Universal Church. The assembling of the Catholic Bishops is as easie as the gathering together their consent *per literas formatas*, and much more conducive to the desired End; because when assembled they can debate the matters before 'em, and with the greater judgment give their determinations.

But 'tis well known, that had such an Assembly been possible, yet the Church of God for the first 300 years, had no such Assembly, excepting that in the Apostles days, *i. e.* it had no such *Governing part*; which is as if it had been said, There was no Government in the Universal Church the first 300 years.

To gratifie our Author, Let us suppose that the *Universal Church* is as such a Governed Society, and that it hath its Go-

vernours. But though this be so, yet it must be still acknowledged, that a Governour cannot be without Power to Govern; I would therefore beseech my Author to shew me, What is that Power with which this Colledge of Bishops are invested? Is it *Legislative* only, or also *Executive*? Whether the one or the other, is it in the Colledge *Subjectively* and *Formally*, or only in 'em as in *fine seu regulante*, or *supplente*, or How? 'Twould be necessary that our Author consult the *Parisian* Doctors, if he will speak to the purpose, when he espouses their Notion.

Let our Author assert as it pleaseth him at an adventure, it matters not, for his Notion is such as necessarily directs us to conclude what he must, if he will be consistent with himself, assert, and that is this, *All Church-Government is Universal, and as such it must be exercised*; no one being a Governour in the Church, but he that is a Catholick Officer: That the due course of exercising this Power is, when it flows originally from the Head unto all its Members. That it flows from the Invisible, or rather unſeen Head in Heaven immediately unto the visible Head on Earth, is granted by all those who assert an Universal Church-Government; though there is a Dispute among the *Papists*, whether this Head be the Council, or the Pope. As it flows immediately from Christ to the visible Head, so it proceeds from this visible Head unto the Patriarchs, from thence to the Metropolitans, from thence to the Diocesans. For which Reason if any are injur'd by their Diocesan, they may Appeal to their Metropolitan, from thence to their Patriarch, from thence to the Pope or Council. This our Author must hold. That there may be no wrong done the Little Ones of Christ, if any be grieved by One, he may Appeal unto an Higher, till he comes unto the Highest Power on Earth; from whence if he find not relief, he must acquiesce, leaving the whole to him who is in Heaven. But if there be no constant visible Head actually existing, where shall the grieved lodge his last Appeal? The Dean's Substitute supposes an equality of Power in Patriarchs, Metropolitans, and Diocesans; whence if his Diocesan doth abuse his Power, he is not accountable to any Metropolitan, nor Patriarch, but only unto the *Catholick Colledge*. The which being so, 'twill follow, That Executive Power must be lodg'd in some Supreme Head *Subjectively*, who can receive Appeals;

Appeals: I say *Subjectively*, or *Formally*, and not only *Virtually*; for 'tis an Executive Power only that can relieve in this case; which cannot *Actually* be, where 'tis only *Virtually*. For which Reason 'tis evident, that according to our Author, there must be a *fixed Governing part* invested with an *Executive Power*, from whom relief is to be expected, if at any time the Diocesan doth abuse his Power; which Governing part must be either a *Colledge of Bishops*, or one *single Person*. And if the obtaining the former be, as indeed 'tis impossible, the acknowledging the latter is necessary.

Thus we see how fairly this Gentleman at length leads us to *Rome*, or some other Pope, as the only necessary way of governing the Church. In doing which, he doth but carry on the Project, of which Sir Francis Winnington takes notice at the Trial of the Lord Stafford, when he assured the Lords, *That as an encouragement to the POPISH PLOTTERS, there did appear in some men too easie and favourable a Disposition towards the PAPISTS. They were grown strangely MODERATE towards these OLD ENEMIES of our Church and State. New PROJECTS of RECONCILING of us were set on foot, and Books were written to distinguish the Church of Rome from the Court of Rome. One of those Books, which was Printed the year before the Discovery of the Plot, pretends, That there ought to be a Difference made between Papists of LOTAL and DISLOYAL Principles. This Book, as it was written more ARTIFICIALLY than the rest, and Published in so Critical and Dangerous a juncture, deserves, and I doubt not in time will have a particular Consideration. 'Tis easie to believe how great Encouragement this must give to the ROMANISTS, to see how very willing men were to meet them, and how freely the Pen was drawn in their Favour.*

By this time the Reader may easily see who 'tis that is subservient to the *Popish Design*, and without any further help clearly perceive what is the Tendency of our Author's Discourse. There remaineth only one objection which calls for our observation, the which can be no sooner remov'd, but the Reader may be fully satisfied in this, *viz.* That 'tis not impossible for one who Assents and Consents to the Thirty nine Articles, the Book of Common-prayer, and of Homilies, to drive on a *French* (not to say a *Popish*) Design.

The

The Objection that occurs to a common capacity, is, How can such that give in Assent and Consent to all that is *said* of the excellency of the present Establishment, do any thing that tends to its subversion?

The Answer is easie; You must distinguish between the *sayings* and the *things* assented and consented unto. For you do not Assent unto the *Sayings*, though about the excellency of the present Establishment, but the *Things*; for saith he, p. 105. We do not give our Assent to every *saying* in the Common-prayer-book, but to every *thing* which is contained in, and prescrib'd by it; that is, what we are bound to use. Whence observe, That seeing a Papist can comply with all the Ceremonies in use, even when he cannot Assent to all the Sayings in the Common-prayer-book, he may give in his Assent, and Consent, and be as true a Son of the Church of *England* as our Author is.

S E C T. III.

A Third Overt-act of the Enquirers pretended Immodesty, examined. The aversness of the Dean and his Substitute to a Protestant Union, proved. Their falling in with the Dissenters about conscience, considered. Some Remarks on the Author's modest treatment of others.

THE Enquirer charges the Dean and some of the *Episcopal*, to be against any compliances with the Dissenter, as if they set a greater value on the Honour and Reputation of men, than on Union, or the relieving tender consciences, which is said to be a malicious and impudent charge. Words very modest, as they drop from our Author's pen!

To this Ple reply, if possibly, *modestly*, without passing any further censure on the heat with which the Deans Defender expresseth himself.

'Tis true I did charge the *Dean* and some others of the *Episcopal*, as persons who would not condescend to part with the *dealt Joke* for Union; for these Reasons:

1. The *Dissenters* have used all just means, but without success, for the obtaining of it.

2. Some of the *Episcopal Clergy* have for these last Twenty years made it their business to stir up *Authority* to a severe execution of such Laws as were made against *Dissenters*.

3. They were not ashamed to expose His Majesty to the great contempt of His people, when he began to shew pity and compassion to the oppressed *Dissenters*. What *Investives* came out after it! What *Satyrical* Declamations against it!

4. The Dr. himself judg'd a *severe execution* of Laws against *Dissenters*, to be the most effectual means for the obtaining a firm and a lasting *Union*. And therefore,

1. Preached that *Sermon* which has been the shameful occasion of our late contests. Thus they pret's for a Conformity as the only way to *Union*, as if there can be no *Union* among *Christians* without *such* Uniformity.

2. He so states the case between Relief and no Relief to *Dissenters*, as to incline more for no Relief. He hath but Three Arguments for Relief, and Six against it. Dr. *Stil. Preface*, p. 53, 54.

3. He inveighs against a *boundless Toleration*, as the Mother of all confusion; and then tells us, That the suspension of Penal Laws against Protestant *Dissenters*, is to open the Flood-gates to such a boundless Toleration; and yet they are for great Abatements.

In *fine*, 'tis remarkable, That notwithstanding the many Protestations made of a propension toward a *real union* between *Conformist* and *Nonconformist*, nothing is more notoriously evident, than that *those* among the *Dissenters* who are *mostly disposed* to some compliances with the *Episcopal*, are above all others hated and contemned by such as our Author.

There are some among *Dissenters*; (namely the *Reverend* Mr. Baxter, and Mr. *Humbrey*,) whose Moderation in these things hath been ever since their ejection for their *Nonconformity* practically discover'd to the whole Kingdom. They frequently attend on the *Conformists* Ministry, not scrupling to be present at their prayers, nor at the *Sacrament* of the Lords Supper. Yea, they shew with the greatest evidence desirable, That their *disposition* toward the accommodating the matters in difference

ence between *Conformist* and *Nonconformist* is such, that nothing but apparent *sin* should hinder their conformity. But yet none more expos'd to contempt by the Dean and his Substitute, than these men ! 'Tis Mr. Baxter who writes in a continued fit of anger. 'Tis he is the man to be pitied ; and no wonder, for his Substitute gives great reason for it, *viz.* Mr. B. is the *Judas*, the most dangerous Enemy that lodges in the bosome of the Church ; a *Cataline*, a *Protean Religionist*, who transforms himself into all shapes ; and differs from the *Hobbist* only in this, That the *Hobbist* is for being always of his Prince's Religion, but he is always for being against it. P. 234.

This is the character which the Dean's Defender gives of that Reverend and Peaceable Divine, Mr. Baxter, and that principally, because he is so much inclin'd to unite with the Conformist ; as if the Gentleman, and such as are of his Gang, were afraid of a Protestant Union.

But, Sir, is this the way to Union ? Is this the way to peace ? What, to let out all your wrath, and rage, and fury, against such as are most peaceable, and ready to unite with you ? What thinking and unbiass'd mind can be persuaded to conclude, That those very men, who after such an unclean and indecent manner revile the peace-maker, are in love with peace ? Is it possible that he who considers so complying a person as Mr. Baxter is, to be for that reason a *Judas*, a *Cataline*, a *Protean Religionist*, should be pleas'd with his compliances ?

This certainly doth but discover, That if the *Nonconformists* could conscientiously conform to more than really they can, it would not conduce to their relief, if such as our Author could prevent ; They must do all you exact, or else no peace to be expected ; they must comply with every *iota*, or no Union. Moreover, when they have conformed to every impos'd *iota*, they must also separate themselves from all the good Christians in the Land that are not of their persuasion in every thing, or be still *Schismatical* ; yea, though a man conforms, if he be more of a *Christia* in temper than our hot and fiery Author, that is, if he be but *compassionate* towards *Dissenters*, shewing a tenderness to their *Consciences*, 'tis enough to make him the object of their rage. Witness the *Country Conformist*, who notwithstanding the greatness of his Learning, and the excellency of his

his temper, discovered in his *Remarks*, is treated by the Dean's Substitute, *Pref.* p. 6. as one who is for raising a Civil War for the pulling down Church and State, to set up a Presbyterian Parity. Thus they deal with such as are for Peace, and yet would be thought to be for great *Abatements* for peace sake, as men sincerely dispos'd to unite with us; that is, they are so, if it may be without parting with one *iota* for Union.

The *High-flown Conformists*, with whom only our present Controversie is, are very much for Union, even when 'tis most obvious, that the utmost they are for, is the exposing the Dissenter: Let the Dissenters do what they can, these men will not be pleas'd. There are several *sizes* among the Dissenters, some can *Conscientiously* do more for Union than others can; but they that do the most, are not freer from the lash of their Tongues and Pens, nor from the execution of their Laws than the other. If they come not to Church, then they are *Disobedient, Seditious, Factionous*, and what not? If they do go to the Church, they are *Fudasses, Catalines, Protean Religionists, Hobbists, &c.*

These things consider'd, Let any moderate man judge, what 'tis they'll part with for Union, what are those *iota's*. Not that I accuse all Conformists, but a few, even those only who are of the same *stamp* with our *Author*, who seem to raze the foundations of the present Constitution; For I am confident, that there are many of the very *Clergy*, who desire nothing so much as the Peace of the Church, and the relieving tender Consciences. And as for the *Magistracy*, 'tis evident, that as few, or none delight to execute the Laws against Dissenters, even so 'tis in the heart of our *Sovereign*, the *House of Lords*, and of the *Commons of England*, that an Expedient be found out for the uniting Protestants, and the easing those burdens that have so long lain on Dissenters; so that through God's Grace we may see a happy Union among Protestants, even when the Dean and his Substitute will not part with an *iota* for it.

But you'll say, the Dr. makes Proposals for Union in the very Preface against which I write. *Ans.* 1. If the Doctor contradicts himself, whose fault is that? But 2. 'Tis true the Dean made a Proposal of some *Abatements* in order unto Union, but unto whom? Let our skilful Interpreter, the Dean's Substitute declare. The Dean saith, *We do heartily and sincerely desire Union, &c.*

The meaning of which is, (saith our Dean's Interpreter) that we are sincerely willing to make any Condescensions for Peace-sake, which will not overthrow the Church of England, nor insinuate a false and scandalous Accusation of the Unlawfulness of our Constitution and Rites of Worship, which we cannot do with a safe Conscience, because we believe the contrary, &c. And we are not so charitable to give ease to other mens Consciences to injure our own, and thereby condemn the Reformation, &c.

In answer unto this, I must say, what I did unto the Dean, [Enquiry, p. 33.] It must be observed, That Dissenters not Conforming to Episcopacy and Ceremonies, is a judging them Unlawful; which is in the Opinion of our Churchmen, a casting a Reproach and Dishonour on the Reformation of the Church of England, &c. To which I add, That the Churches parting with any of those Rites of Worship, which the Dissenters cannot conscientiously comply with, may insinuate into the minds of some men the Notion of their Unlawfulness. Whence, if there must be no Abatements made, but such as do not insinuate an Unlawfulness in the Episcopal Constitution, nor in the Rites of Worship, what manner of Abatements can there be made? 'Tis evident then, that the Doctor's Proposal made with such Restrictions and Limitations for Union, is but a more plausible way of denying it. But what is the great Reason, why there must be no such compliance, as may be attended with such Insinuations, but this, 'Tis inconsistent with the Honour of the Reformation, or rather of the Reformers: For I remember, that when the talk was about blasting the Honour of the first Reformation, the meaning was, the casting a reproach upon Cranmer, Ridley, &c. the first Reformers; And why may we not understand it now in the same sense in this place? And if so, How is the Charge untrue? How comes it to be either Impudent or Malicious? Here is the Talk of Conscience, They cannot do it with a safe Conscience, this surprizeth me. What! Is the Dean and his Defender fallen into such a gross piece of Fanaticisme, as to talk of their not being able to make any Abatements in the fore-described sense with a safe Conscience! How comes this about? I am hereby inclin'd to think, That they make the Scripture the Rule not only of their Doctrines, but Worship, and Discipline, a Presbyterian Principle. And, that 'tis the Opinion of their Consciences,

ences, that *Episcopacy* is of *Divine Right*, and consequently *Unalterable*. For they must not admit of any thing contrary to the Opinion of their Consciences; still Fanaticisme, a justifying the Dissenter, who cannot *Conscientiously* Conform! Only there is an untoward Insinuation in't on the Doctor's part, namely, That the *Episcopal* Constitution is of *Divine Right*, and that our Church-men are not overmuch owing to our Governours for its Establishment; That if our Governours should go about to make any *Alteration* in the present Constitution, they offend God: For which our Governours won't give them any great thanks. But sure a mans *Conscience* may permit another, whom he cannot change, to do that which it will not permit himself to do.

Thus having considered the *Overtacts* of the Enquirers pretended *Immodesty*, let our *Author* make the most on't, and let the Reader judge, Whether there was not somewhat more than the *Reflection* on the *Enquirer*, that brought forth his first Chapter? Whether his propensions to favour our Common Enemy the *Papist*, were not stronger than his Aversions to the Enquirers *Immodesty*?

Here I would have put an end unto this Chapter, had it not been requisite to take some notice of the like *Treatment* which he affords Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Humfrey*, the *Country-Conformist*, and Doctor *Owen*. Not that I design to enlarge on this Subject, but only to give the Reader a Taste of the *Modesty* of our *Author*, who accuses others so of *Immodesty*.

1. As for his usage of Mr. *Baxter*, 'tis such, that how immodest soever I may be esteem'd, I must solemnly profess, that I cannot without defiling my Pen express it aright: I will not therefore take any other notice of it than to say, It becomes not a *Man*, much less a *Christian*, much less a *Presbyter* of the Church of England, to treat the unworthiest of men after such a rate as he has treated Mr. *B.* I am sure, 'tis recorded in the Sacred Scriptures, that *Michael the Archangel* durst not bring a railing *Accusation* against the Devil. And Oh, How unmeet then is it for this man of inferior Dignity, to rail at one so eminent in Piety and Learning!

Metbinks 'tis a pitiful shift, when men have nothing but hard words to answer hard Arguments with: A way the most ineffectual indeed to that End, the confuting a Learned Adversary;

but the best perhaps that can be to come off. For really where there is so little of solid Answer to what Mr. Baxter hath urged against the Dean, this Gentlemans Treatise is beneath Mr. H's notice; and his hard words deserving no other Reply than, *The Lord rebuke thee.*

2. Mr. Humphrey and the Country-Conformist must come next under the Gentleman's Pen, They must be *Immodest* too, as I am, and who can help it?

But what is the matter? what is it that occasions all this stir? Really I cannot imagine, unless Mr. Humphrey's *Faithfulness* to the Dean, express'd in a way suitable to his *wonted Freedom*, be the cause. 'Tis true, the *Country Conformist* takes notice of Mr. H's late Book, giving him thanks for that *judicious Treatise*, saying, That he had *modestly* and *plainly* rebuk'd the *pride* of the Dr. and given Mr. Baxter his *due praise*. From whence our Author takes occasion to run into a Discourse on the *Modesty* of Mr. Humphrey, and produces several of his expressions, which in the apprehension of some others, who, it may be, do more impartially, yea and more agreeably to the *Christian Rule*, weigh the nature of the Dean's Discourse, &c. are not so lyable to exception as our *Author* suggests.

'Tis well known that the Reverend Mr. H. is a grave Minister, it may be twenty years elder than Dr. Stillingfleet, for which reason a reproof (though plain and open) may be proper in him, which would not become me or this *Author*; especially, considering that this Mr. H. is one whose inclinations to conformity are such, that there can be nothing of humour to keep him from a closure with the Dean, or to provoke him to an unnecessary quarrel; which is enough to engage a judicious person to conclude, That if *such a man* as Mr. H. treats the Dean severely, there is somewhat extraordinary in the Dr. that call'd for it.

In this opinion I am abundantly confirmed, when I remember what Mr. Baxter in the Preface of his *Second Defence* says of him, which is, That he handles the Dr. *somewhat freely*, that is, as the *Country Conformist* interprets it, *very honestly*, as the Dr. deserv'd; and for this reason, though our *Author*, who it may be hath not that sense of *Conscientious duties* upon him, as these others have, does blame it, yet it may be worthy commendation. For what should tempt so *Learned* and *Judicious* a person, as the

Country

Countrey Conformist is, to be so full in approving it, unless the very subject-matter of the Drs. Discourse, or the mode of managing it, did suggest, that the greatest kindness could be shewn the Dr. was to deal plainly and uprightly in discovering unto him his *sin*?

But this is enough to *expose the Countrey Conformist* presently to the same lash. He is also *immodest*; and why? surely for no other reason, that I can imagine, but because he is not afraid to speak the *Truth*, and to give to the world an assurance, That the *Dean's* Discourse was not grateful unto every Conformist; and that therefore, whoever would insinuate as if the Dr. had given us the sense of all his Conforming Brethren in that great Book, would abuse and injure some of the most judicious and godly among the *Conforming Clergy*.

He hath really done the *true Church of England* great right, in making not only his *Reflections on the Deans Preface*, but also his *Remarks on the Book* it self, a *Treatise* worthy the observation of the *Dean*, seeing the answering that, as appears by our Authors silence, is beyond his strength; that is, it is so candidly wrote, as he should be ashamed to except against it.

I need not say any thing concerning the *Reverend Dr. Owen*, because as our Author has spoken little of his person (though more than became him) but *less* by way of answer to his *Book*. However it must be remembred, That seeing our Author found himself necessitated to run unto the *Tents of the French Papist* for Armour to batter down the Notion Dr. O. hath established in proving a *particular Church to be the $\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\rho\iota\varsigma\ \delta\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\eta$ of Church-Government*; the Drs. notion abides in its strength, and his Book unanswered in the sense of any sound Protestant; and therefore this *Feeble Defence of the Dean of Pauls*, is unworthy of so great a persons Animadversions. And that the Dean himself is no way reliev'd by this Defender, but as much oblig'd to attempt it himself, as if this Defence had never been published.

CHAP. II.

A Reply to what the Deans Substitute suggests in his censuring the Enquirers Design.

THIS Gentleman not being able to satisfy himself with his tedious Essay to evince the Enquirer to be a person neither very Modest, nor very Peaceable, gives himself the liberty of censuring the Design, as if it had been rather to reproach the Dr. than to vindicate and clear up the innocency of the Dissenter. Thus he suggests that Mr. Lobb wrote what he wrote to expose the Dean to popular odium and fury; to persuade the people never to look into the Deans book, or to stone him as an implacable enemy to all Loyal Dissenters. Pref. p. 30. Book p. 6.

What reply is necessary to be made unto this charge, is not easy to imagine; for what though I should solemnly declare, That the casting reproach on Dr. Stillingfleet, or any other person, is what I perfectly hate; will he believe me? I can, and hereby do declare so much; but is it possible our Author should give credit to any such protestation, so long as 'tis almost natural for a man of his composition to judge of others according to those over-strong propensions he finds in himself to such exposing practices?

However, let me ask the Author what 'tis that provokes him to talk so confidently of the most secret motions of my soul? Why must exposing the Dean to popular odium and fury, be my end? What overt-acts were there of such a design? Did I misrepresent the Dean in any one instance? Or did I make it my business to carp at every little thing in his Preface? Did I insist on far-fetch consequences, or force any undue sense on his words? Did I speak all I could to shew the Tendency of his Preface, or whole Book? Or did I take notice of any thing more than what was necessary for the clearing up the innocency of the Dissenter? As to these particulars, you cannot fasten your Accusation; but yet my aim must be exposing the Dean; and why exposing

posing him? What, was the *Dean* expos'd, because the charge with which he would load Dissenters, was such, that the very repeating and confuting it, tends to his Reproach? If so, whose fault is that?

I do freely confess, That I believe the *Deans* charge against Dissenters to be so indecent, that thereby he hath lost very much of that Esteem he formerly had among Judicious Gentlemen of the *Church of England*; but this is not my fault, nor an Argument, that what I wrote in the Defence of the Dissenter, was with a design of exposing the *Dean*. A thing I could have easily done, without either wresting his words, or imposing a foreign sense on 'em.

How easily could I have imitated the famous Bishop *Jewel*, and have pick'd such passages out of the *Dean's* Discourses, as that *Great Prelate* did out of *Harding*, and have shewed how unlike himself the *Dean* acted, in condemning and pitying the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, in comparing Mr. *Allop's* Discourse to the *Bird of Athens*, made up of Face and Feathers; and representing Mr. *Allop* himself so, as if *all things had not been right*, that is, as if he had been mad. Of this I the rather take notice, because a very serious person on the reading the *Dean's* Book, came to me on purpose, to enquire whether Mr. *Allop* was never mad? If not, said he, Why did Dr. *Stillingfleet* write as if he had? Many other things of a more *uncomely* aspect I could have taken out of the *Dean's* Writings, but I wou'd it, it not being my work in that *Enquiry*, or this *Reply*, to acquaint the World with the *navis* of the Reverend Doctor; and therefore notwithstanding the many provocations you have given me in your *Defence of the Dean*, I'm resolv'd to treat the *Dean* more civilly than he did Mr. B. or Mr. H. or than you have Mr. B. or Mr. H. and the *Country Conformist*.

The exposing men to *Popular Odium* and *Fury*, becomes only such who hate *Persons* more than their *Opinions*, and who have little to offer against their Adversaries besides hard words. It becomes not men, who pretend to act suitably to the Christian Rule, to use railing Expressions instead of pungent Arguments; nor to expose the Person, instead of confuting his Opinion.

For this Reason I did in the *Modest and Peaceable Enquiry*, on a second perusal, expunge all such words as might seem hard or unmeet, treating the *Dean* with the greatest Candour and Respect,
not

not suffering one passage to go to the Press, that might tend to his reproach, unless rehearsing the charge laid in against the Dissenter as cloath'd with his own words, and the confusing him, must be esteem'd as such.

'Tis true, I shew'd the *Tendency* of his Discourse, which I thought to be for the advancing the *Papal Interest*. The very thing the Dean's Substitute drives at in the Dean's Defence, wherein our Author goes much further than the *Dean*, or at least hath expressed his sentiments more *freely*, and *wish less caution*. But shall this be considered as an exposing you to popular odium and fury? You assert, *That the Universal Church is a govern'd Society; That the Bishops in their Colledge are the governing part; That the Bishops conven'd in their Assembly, do not meet only for mutual Help and Concord, but for Regiment.* The Assembly of Bishops in Council, is not such as that of Princes of several distinct Territories, who meet together in order to the maintaining and conserving a general Union and Peace in the World; for instance, that at *Nimwegen*, at which Convention the *Princes* come freely; and when there, the One is not under the *Regiment* of the Assembly, but each one free to Consent or Dissent to any thing proposed for Peace, their Territories being as so many distinct Independent Governments, whose Governours are not accountable to any General Council of Princes in the World. Such an Assembly of Bishops you are not for: For this, say you, p. 601. makes *Christian Communion* as Arbitrary a thing, as the Confederacies of *Princes*; whereas the *Episcopal Office* is but *One*, and therefore ought to be administr'd by the *mutual Advice and Consent of Bishops*, who all equally share in it; that is, the whole World must be considered as of *One* and the same Government; that the many particular Princes of distinct Territories, such as *England, France, Spain, Denmark, &c.* are not *Independent* in their Government, but are accountable either unto *One Universal Emperour, or Diet, &c.* This is what you assert as to *Church-Government*, 'tis *One* all the *World over*. Though lesser Societies are variously dispersed, yet are all under one and the same Government, the Bishops of the one and of the other are oblig'd to meet together in their *Colledge, or Diet*, where they are all bound to submit unto the *Canons, Decrees, or Determinations* of the Colledge; that whoever

dissents

diffents from the Body of the Colledge is Schismatical. --- This is your Notion, and for ought I know the *Deans*; a Notion that is the same with that of the *French Papacy*, that doth but fairly lead us to *Rome*.

But must the mentioning so much, expose you to the rage and fury of the people? If so, whom can you blame, but your self? The like may be said to the Dean, to whom I add this one request; which is, to consider the *Tendency* of his great Book, as well as of *this your Defence* of him; and if his *Aimes* and the *Tendency* of either of these Discourses be different, 'twill be apparent that I was not mistaken in my Charity of the Author, when I pass'd my censure on his Treatise. However 'tis sufficient, that the utmost I did was to expose the evil Tendency of the Book, endeavouring as much as possibly I could, to save the *Dean* from lying under Reproach, distinguishing between the Author and his Work.

This much may serve as more than enough to our *Author's* Censure of invisible and unknown Designs.

CHAP. III.

A Reply to the Defence of the Dean of Paul's, so far as it concerns the Modest and Peaceable Enquiry.

SECT. I.

The Answer to what the Enquirer insisted on in shewing the Deans Mistakes about the Jesuits Doctrine, concerning Spiritual Prayer, Examined. § 1. *The present Aids of the Spirit in enabling Ministers in the Exercise of their Function, agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of England.* Dr. Burnet's most Christian Reproof to such Ministers, as neglect the inward Motions of the Spirit. § 2. *The Ground of the first Separation in Queen Elizabeths days, the very same with that of the first Reformation from Popery, beginning in Henry the 8th's time, and Sealed after with the Blood of our Martyrs.*

H

THE

THE Dean Substitute doth at last apply himself to the Defence of the Doctor; in doing which he considers the Reasons I collected out of the Dean's Preface, which the Dean urges to engage the Reader to believe, that the Dissenters are a people carrying on the Popish Designs.

1. *The Dissenters have embraced the Jesuits Principles about Spiritual Prayer, and a more pure way of Worship.* This is what I observ'd out of Dr. Still. But our Author, who hath read over the Doctors Preface very carefully, can find no such thing urged against the Dissenters, and adds, *All that Mr. Lobb founds this Accusation on, is, That the Dean says, It is not improbable that the Jesuits were the first setters up of Spiritual Prayer in England: And then goes on to a very decent Censure, saying, That this is mighty falsely and imperfectly represented.*

Sir, If I had insisted on no more than what you here mention as the foundation of my Charge, I must acknowledg, that 'twould not only be imperfectly, but impertinently related: For what connexion is there between the *Jesuits Practices*, and their *Principles*?

Is it not well known, that the Principles they profess, the Doctrines they embrace concerning many a point in Divinity, are one thing, even when their Practice is another? May they not then, in order to the carrying on a further Design, set on *Practices* contrary to their *Doctrines*? Yea, surely they may; and this is the whole Defence you make in behalf of the Dean, with which after an unnecessary Harangue, you dismiss the Subject.

But is this fair, to misrepresent an Adversary, and then confute what needs no Confutation? Doth this redound to the Honour of a *Presbyter of the Church of England*? Was this all on which Mr. Lobb founded his Accusation? Did he not add somewhat more than what you relate? You say, all that Mr. Lobb founds this accusation on is, that the Dean says, *It is not improbable that the Jesuits were the first setters up of Spiritual Prayer in England; which is mighty falsely and imperfectly represented.* p. 6. For whoever will consult the Enquiry will find, that I do out of the Dean add, *That there is no improbability of the thing, if we consider the Dissenters pretences about Spiritual Prayer, to the Do-*
ctrine.

Crime and Practice of the Jesuits. The Dean suggests, that Spiritual and Free Prayer, even that Spiritual and Free Prayer about which there is such a Pother, is suited to the *Doctrines* of the Jesuits; to the Doctrine, that is, to their *Principles*. What difference is there between the Doctrine and the Principles of the Church of England? In like manner I Query, What difference is there between the *Doctrines* and *Principles* of the Jesuits? Doth the Dean then assert such an Agreement to be between the *Preences* of the Dissenter about Spiritual Prayer, and the *Doctrines* or *Principles* of the Jesuits, not only the Practices but *Doctrines* of the Jesuits? Who then is the imperfect or mistaken Reporter?

The Dean's Charge against Dissenters is, That the Dissenters pretences about Spiritual Prayer, are suited with the *Doctrines* of the Jesuits. And 'tis our concern to enquire after the truth of this Charge; I say of this charge; to wit, about the *Agreeableness* that is between our *Preences* and their *Doctrines*. For it is no way momentous to enquire after the practice of a company of Villains, who can transform themselves into a thousand shapes, whenever their Interest obliges them to do so. Was it never known that a Papist crept into some great Preferment in the Church of England, at which time they did both Assent and Consent to the doctrines of the Church of England? What think you of a *quondam* Bishop of Gloucester, to mention no more? did he not speak well of the Church of England, yea even of the Protestant Religion? Is it therefore Popery?

For this Reason it concerns me not to enquire after those Stories insisted on by the Doctor, or to be found in that Pamphlet called *Foxes and Firebrands*. The great Enquiry must be after the *Doctrines* of the Jesuit, whether there is any suitableness between the Dissenters pretences and the *Jesuits Doctrines*. For which Reason the Jesuits Writings were consulted, and the Doctor's Charge found *untrue*; the Dr. being *mistaken* as to *matter of fact*. He represented the Jesuits Doctrines to be other than indeed they are, which, to speak softly, was a *Mistake*.

If the Dean's Defender would have spoke to the purpose, He should have searched those places I insisted on in *Azorins*, *Filiucius*, and *Bellarmino*, and have shewed wherein I had either made a false report of their sayings, or misinterpreted 'em. But this was impossible.

H 2

There

There being nothing else of moment in the Reply to what I offered against the *Dean* about *Spiritual Prayer*, I might fairly, without saying any thing more, proceed to the next particular. But seeing some have spoken contemptibly of the *Spirit of prayer*, which is said to assist such as use *free or extempore prayer*, as if those who spake of receiv'd help from the Spirit in prayer, were *Enthusiastical*, &c. and because our Author talks as if the Jesuits had the first hand in the *Separation of the old Nonconformists from the Church of England*, crying down the Common-prayers as a dull, formal, superstitious Worship, and the setting up *free prayer* in the room of it; I will shew,

1. The sense of the *first Reformers* about the *aid of the Spirit*.

And 2. What was the great and chief ground of the *First Separation*.

§ 1. Concerning the *Aid of the Holy Spirit*, by which many are enabled to *pray freely or spiritually*, it hath been by some of the *Conforming Ministers* asserted, That such as pretend to receive the aid of the Spirit, may as well pretend to *inspiration*, &c. That then they'll believe that persons can pray by the Spirit, when they hear the unlearned can pray in *Latin, Greek*, or in some other *unknown language*; as if the *aids the Spirit* affords unto such as pray freely, had been *extraordinary*, &c.

This I cannot but consider, as what doth very much reflect on the *Dispensation of the Spirit*, to the great dishonour of true Christian Religion. For such is the present state of *true Religion*, that whoever speaks contemptibly of the *Spirits Aid*, must be esteemed not only a *Despiser of the first Reformers*, but of that part of the present Constitution to which our *Clergy* on their entrance into their Function are *principally concern'd*.

1. 'Tis well known that what the *first Reformers* did in the *Reforming the Liturgy*, was by the *Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons assembled in Parliament*, recorded to have been done by the *Aid of the Holy Ghost*.

The Parliament in *K. Edward's* days passing an Act for the confirmation of the *Publick Liturgy* in the preamble thereof, declare, *That those who drew up that Order of Divine Worship*, did it by the *Aid of the Holy Ghost*. 'Tis true this expression could not escape the censure of such as were *Popishly affected*, they thinking

thinking it too much that it was said, the Book was drawn by the *aid of the Holy Ghost*, as if the import of those expressions had been nothing less than that those persons concern'd in the drawing it up, had been *extraordinarily inspir'd*. But 'twas well answer'd by such as said, That it must not be so understood; that 'twas only to be taken in that sense as *all good motions and consultations* are directed or assisted by the secret influences of Gods H. Spirit, which doth often help good men, even in their imperfect actions, where the good that is done is justly ascrib'd to the grace of God. For this consult that truly Judicious and Deserving Dr. Burnet in his *History of the Reformation*, Part 2. lib. 1. p. 94. The same that is said of this expression when applied to the first Composers of the Divine Service, may be said of such as are assisted in *free prayer* by the *secret Influences of the Holy Spirit*. Moreover,

2. The Clergy at their Ordination were to receive the *Holy Ghost*. In King Edward's days, whenever a Bishop, or Priest, was Ordained, 'twas said, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost in the Name of the Father*, &c. But to what purpose, if not to *aid and assist them* in the discharge of their Ministerial Function, viz. in *Prayer*, in *Preaching*, in *giving private Admonitions*, and *Exhortations*? &c. Hence I argue, The Spirit accordingly is given them, or not. If not, no wonder they reproach its work, and gracious Influences, to say no more? But if they do at their Ordination receive a plentiful portion of the Spirit, how can they talk so much against the *Assistances* thereof, vouchsafed to others? What, is it confin'd unto the Clergy only, or unto the Episcopal Clergy, that none without *canting* must mention One word of the Spirit? But

3. 'Tis surprizing, that any of our Clergy should speak any thing against the *secret motions of Gods Spirit*; for surely such of them as are just, and true, and faithful to God, and their own souls, have *actually felt* so much of the *Internal* workings of the *Holy Ghost on their souls*, that they were thereby quickned, and moved to enter on the work of the Ministry. Thus 'tis with them, or at least, they are conscientiously perswaded of as much; and can such as have felt the power of the Holy Ghost on their own hearts, speak evil of the Assistance it affords unto others? That the honest among the Episcopal Clergy are such as know what 'tis to be moved by the *Holy Spirit*, as they them-

themselves trust, is evident from the answer they give to the question propos'd to them, when they are presented to Orders, which is, *Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Ministration to serve God for the promoting his glory, and for the edifying his people?* To which the answer is, *He trusts he is.*

It may be some may inquire, How comes it to pass then that so many of the *Clergy* thus ordained, do not only neglect their own work, but by their *uncomely discourses* reflect on this very spirit? To this no other answer but that of the *Learned* and *Pious* Dr. Burnet shall be given, who in his *Hist. of the Reformation*, Par. 2. l. p. 145. thus expresseth himself: 'It has been oft lamented, that many come to receive Orders before they have seriously read over these Questions, and examined themselves whether they could with a good conscience make the Answers there prescribed; since it is scarce credible that men of common honesty would lye in the presence of God on so great an occasion; and yet 'tis too visible, that many have not any such inward vocation, nor have ever considered seriously what it is. If it were well apprehended, that heat that many have to get into Orders would soon abate, who perhaps have nothing in their eye but some place of Profit, or Benefice, to which way must be made by that preceding Ceremony; and so enter into Orders as others are associated into Fraternities and Corporations, with little previous sense of that Holy Character they are to receive, when they thus dedicate their Lives and Labours to the Service of God in the Gospel. In the *Primitive Church* the apprehension of this made even good and holy men afraid to enter under such bonds; and therefore they were often to be drag'd almost by force, or catcht at unawares, and be so initiated; as appears in the Lives of these two *Greek Fathers*, *Nazianzen* and *Chrysostome*. If men make their first step to the Holy Altar by such a lye, as is their pretending to a *motion of the Holy Ghost*, concerning which they know little, but that they have nothing at all of it, they have no reason to expect that Blessing which otherwise attends on such Dedications. And it had been happy for the Church if all those that are authorized to confer Orders, had stood on this more critically, and not been contented with a bare putting these Questions to those

‘ those who come to be Ordain’d, but had used a due strictness
 ‘ before-hand, suitable to that grave admonition of St. Paul to Ti-
 ‘ mothy, Lay hands suddenly on no man, and be not partakers of
 ‘ other mens sins.

How would the Church have flourish’d if this worthy Drs. counsel had been both given and taken at the beginning of the Reformation! If all that entred on the Ministry had felt the mighty power of the Spirit in turning them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God! How would they have labour’d for the conversion and edification of their hearers! The which work could not prosper in their hands, but such as were born of God, receiving the Spirit, would have been enabled by it to cry *Abba Father*. Spiritual and free prayer would have been from the beginning so well known, that the suggesting it to have been Jesuitical, would with the greatest contempt and scorn be rejected; and those many rash and indecent epithets given it, would have been consider’d but as the overtacts of ill-will to the Reformation of the Church of England.

§. II. The Account our Author gives of the first Separation, is very parrue. For, 1. It was not the laying aside All forms of prayer, that the old Nonconformists prest hard for. They were for the amending the Liturgy, but not for the removing all Liturgies. ’Tis true in K. Edward’s days there was a contest between Hooper and Ridley, &c. about the old Popish Vestments, but not about Forms of Prayer. In Queen Maries days at Franckfort, there were great contentions among some of them, who before had used the English Liturgy, but not that those who were against the use of the English Liturgy at that time, were against it as it was a Form of Prayer, but they apprehended that they being in foreign parts, they should rather accommodate their worship to those among whom they liv’d; whence instead of the English Liturgy, they used one near the Geneva and French Forms. Moreover in Queen Elizabeth’s time, even long after the Separation, the old Nonconformists declar’d, that they look’d on Forms of Prayer to be lawful. It may be they were griev’d to see Q. Elizabeth’s Bishops to entertain more favourable thoughts of the Pope than those blessed Martyrs, Crammer, and Ridley did, as is to be seen by their expunging out of Q. Elizabeth’s Liturgy what was offensive to the Pope in K. Edward’s;
 but

but against Forms they were not; or it may be they could not approve of any that would *quench the motions of the Spirit* they professed to have felt before their *Ordination*, whether in trusting unto it for help in the exercise of Prayer, or any other parts of their work. But to cry down all *Forms* in order to the setting up *spiritual and free prayer* instead of the *Liturgy*, and for this reason to separate from the *Church of England*, is more than can be proved.

2. The great and principal reason of the Separation of the old *Nonconformists*, was occasion'd by their pressing towards that *Reformation* expressly aim'd at by our *English Reformers* in *H. 8.'s* time, for the which they were burnt in *Smithfield* and *elsewhere*. Whoever would understand the true Reason of the first Separation in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, must enquire after the first *Reformation* desir'd in *H. 8.'s*.

In *Henry 8th's* days, that wickedness that spread it self throughout the Western part of the World, sadly prevail'd in these Northern parts. This part of the earth was in an especial manner troubled with a vicious and sensual *Clergy*, whose example had a sad influence on the *Common people*. The offspring of a lewd vicious *Clergy*, was a profane and extremely wicked *Laity*; so that if ever, it might now be truly said, *The whole world lay in wickedness*.

This being the state of the *Clergy* and *Laity*, the fear of God and all true Religion almost lost, it pleas'd the Father of mercies to open the eyes of some, to shew 'em the evil of the times, &c. *Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin*, and others beyond the seas, and *Tindal, Frith, Barnes, &c.* here in *England*. These Worthies being deeply sensible of the Abominations of the times in which they liv'd, made diligent search after the causes thereof, in order to the carrying on a *Reformation, &c.* In which enquiry, they found the *viciousness* of the people to be occasioned by the *sensuality* and *lewdness* of the *Clergy*; the *lewdness* of the *Clergy* to be the product of an *uninstituted Hierarchy*, which was rather adjusted for *Worldly grandure* than the glory of God.

The great cause of all those Mischiefs was the want of strict and Scriptural Discipline, which (as it had not been in due exercise since the first degeneracy from the Apostolical Institution and Primitive Practice, even so) could not be faithfully exercised.

cised, but by being *reduced to its antient state*. For which Reason Tyndall applies himself to the work, and so did the famous Lambert and Doctor Barnes. All which I will from good Authority evince.

1. Mr. Tyndall, a blessed Martyr burnt at Brabant for his firm adhering to the *Truths of the Gospel*, doth in those Discourses of his published by Mr. Fox shew, that the many Abominations of his Times proceeded from the viciousness of a *Proud, Covetous, & Sensual Clergy*, who having forsaken the *Apostolical Rule*, in process of time through the Bounty of some wealthy persons, who had embraced the Christian Religion, and divers other ways, got an *abundance of Riches*, which occasioned their *Pride and Luxury*, to the ruine of the true Religion: Thus in that Treatise of *The Obedience of a Christian man*, 'There is no Mischief or Disorders (saith he) whether it be in the Temporal Regiment, or in the Spiritual, whereof they [i. e. *The Spirituality, the Clergy*] are not the chief Causes, and even the very Fountain and Spring, and as we say, the *Well-head*: So that 'tis impossible to Preach against Mischief, except thou begin at *them*; or to set any Reformation in the world, except thou *Reform them first*. This same Mr. Tyndall in another place shews us, how they occasioned so much mischief, in these words, 'But after that the Devil was broke loose, and the *Bishops* began to purchase, and the *Deacons* to scratch all to them, and the *Spirituality* to climb on high, then because the *Labour*, [viz. of examining and confirming the Adult, who had been Baptized in their Infancy] 'seemed too tedious and painful, they neglected it. Tyndal of Sacraments and Ceremonies.

The Clergy growing rich, labour'd that their Honour might equalize their *Wealth*, which was followed with *Idleness*, a Neglect of God and their Duty. Hence Preaching is let down, the Ceremonies being esteem'd as the most effectual means of Instruction. This occasions the multiplication of significant Ceremonies, which was the great Reason of the dreadful Ignorance, into which the whole European world was plundg'd, when Popery prevail'd. So Mr. Tyndall, 'I impute this our grievous fall into so extream and horrible Blindness (wherein we are so deep and so deadly brought asleep) unto nothing so much, as unto the multitude of Ceremonies; for as soon as the Prelats had set
I
'up

‘up such a rabble of Ceremonies, they thought it superfluous to teach the plain Text any longer, and the Law of God, Faith of Christ, &c. forasmuch as all such things were play’d before the peoples faces daily in the Ceremonies, &c. Tyndall of the *Ceremonies of the Mass*.

Thus ’tis evident, that in Henry the 8ths time the great wickedness of that Age was grievous to such as aim’d at *Reformation*; that these wickednesses were occasion’d by the Pride, Covetousness, and Sensuality of the rich Clergy. But

2. ’Tis as manifest, That the *Pride* of the Clergy was discovered by their *Prelacy*, their aspiring after a *Dominion* over their *Brethren*. Whence the One gets the name of *Bishop* appropriated unto him, and with that name an *Unaccountable*, yea an *Unscriptural Power*. So Mr. Tyndall in his *Practice of Prelates*; ‘The Office of a Bishop was a rounge at the beginning that no man coveted, and that no man durst take upon him, save he that loved Jesus Christ better than his own Life. For as Christ saith, That no man might be his Disciple, except that he were ready to forsake Life, and all: Even so might that Officer be sure, that it might cost him his Life at one time or another, for bearing record unto the Truth. But after that the multitude of the Christians were encreased, and many great men had received the Faith; then both Lands and Rents, as well as other Goods; were given unto the maintenance as well of the Clergy, as of the Poor; because they gave then no Tythes to the Priests, nor yet now do, save in certain Countries. For it is too much to give Alms, Offerings, Lands, and Tythes also. And then the Bishops made them *Substitutes* under them to help them, which they called Priests, and kept the name of Bishops to themselves.

‘But out of the *Deacons* sprang all the *Mischief*. For through their hands went all things, they ministred unto the Clergy, they ministred unto the Poor, they were in favour with great and small. And when the Bishops Office began to have rest and be Honourable, then the *Deacons* through Favour and Gifts climbed up thereunto, as lightly as he that hath the old *Abbots Treasure* succeedeth with us. And by the means of their practice and acquaintance in the world, they were more subtle and worldly wise than the old Bishops, and less learned in Gods word, as our

Prelates

“ *Prelates* are, when they come from Stewardships in Gentlemen’s Houses, and from surveying of great mens Lands, &c.
 “ — Then, while they that had the Plow by the tail, looked
 “ back, the *Plow went awry, Faith waxed feeble and faint, Love*
 “ *waxed cold, the Scripture waxed dark, Christ was no more seen;*
 “ He was in the Mount with *Moses*, and therefore the *Bishops*
 “ would have a *God upon the earth*, whom they might see; and
 “ thereupon they began to dispute who should be greatest. So
 far Mr. Tyndal in his *Practice of Popish Prelates*.

3. The Malady, and Disease of those times, with their Causes, were no sooner understood, but several *Worthy Persons* applied themselves to a diligent search after the most proper Remedy, and found, that a *Reformation* must begin among the *Clergy*, that all things must be reduc’d to the *Apostolical Institution*. Discipline must be strictly exercised, the which could not with effect be accomplished, but by bringing all things to the first Institution; For which reason, Mr. Tyndall makes his enquiry after those *Officers the Apostles ordain’d in Christs Church*, and what their *Offices* were, concerning which take Mr. Tyndal’s own sense, in his discourse of the *Practice of Popish Prelates*. “ — Wherefore the
 “ Apostles (saith he) following, and obeying the Rule, Doctrine,
 “ and Commandment of our Saviour Jesus Christ, ordained in his
 “ Kingdom, and Congregation, *Two Officers*: One called after the
 “ Greek word, *Bishop*, in English, an *Overseer*, which same was
 “ called *Priest* after the Greek, *Elder* in English, because of his Age,
 “ Discretion, and sadness; for he was as nigh as could be, always
 “ an *Elderly man*. And this *Overseer* hath put his hands unto the
 “ Plow of Gods Word, and fed Christs Flock, and rended them
 “ only, without looking unto any other business in the world. Another Officer they chose, and called him *Deacon*, after the Greek;
 “ a *Minister* in English, to minister the alms of the people unto the
 “ poor and needy. For in the Congregation of Christ, love maketh
 “ every mans gifts and goods common unto the necessity of his
 “ neighbour. Wherefore the love of God being yet hot in the
 “ hearts of men, the rich that had the substance of this worlds
 “ goods, brought of their abundance great plenty unto the sustentation of the poor, and delivered it unto the hands of the
 “ Deacons.

Mr. Tyndall judg'd, that according to the *Apostolical Institution*, there were no other Officers in the Church but *Elders* and *Deacons*. The *Elders* being of the same Office and Order with the *Bishops*, they being two names belonging to one and the same person. 'There is (saith he) Presbuteros called an Elder by Birth, which same called immediately a Bishop or Overseer to declare what Persons are meant—they were called Elders, because of their Age, Gravity, &c. and Bishops and Overseers by reason of their Offices. And all that were called Elders or Priests (if they so will) were called Bishops also, though they have divided the names now, which thing thou mayest evidently see by the first Chap. of Titus, and the 20th. of the Acts—Those Overseers, which we now call Bishops after the Greek word, were alway bidding in one place to Govern the Congregation there. (Tyndal of the word Elder.) But Deacons were Overseers of the Poor and crept not into Orders till the Church grew Rich.

Tyndal was not alone in this opinion, it being also the sense of Famous Lambert and Dr. Barns, who strenuously defended, and at the last sealed this Truth with their blood: One of the Articles for which they were burnt, being about the Order of Priesthood.

Please give you in the first place Lambert's own answer to the ninth Article, as I find it in *Acts and Mon.* Vol. 2. 'As touching Priesthood (saith Lambert) in the *Primitive Church*, when virtue bare (as ancient Doctors do deem, and Scripture in mine opinion recordeth the same) the most room, there were no more Officers in the Church of God than *Bishops* and *Deacons*; that is to say, Ministers; as witnesseth, beside Scripture, full apertly Hierome in his Commentaries upon the *Epistles* of Paul; whereas he saith, That those that we call *Priests*, were all one, and no other but *Bishops*; and the *Bishops* none other but *Priests*, men ancient both in Age and Learning, so near as they could be chosen. Neither were they institute and chosen as they be now-adays, with small regard of a Bishop or his Officer, only appointing them if they can construe a Collect; but they were chosen not only of the Bishop, but also with the consent of the people among whom they should have their living, as sheweth Saint Cyprian; and the people (as he saith) ought to have power to chuse their priests, that be men of good Learning, of good and honest

' *next report* : but alack for pity, such *Elections* are now banished,
 ' and new fashions brought in, which if we should confer with
 ' the form of the *Election* shewed of Christ by his Apostle *Paul*,
 ' we should find no small diversity ; but all turned upside down.
 ' To conclude, I say, the *Order or State of Priests and Deacons*,
 ' was ordained by God ; but *Subdeacons* and *Conjurers*, otherwise
 ' called *Exorcists*, or *Acolites*, which we call *Benet* and *Collect*,
 ' were instituted by the invention of men ; and this you may
 ' find in the Law, *Dist. 21.* and other places, where it is writ-
 ' ten, *Subdiaconatus tempore Apostolorum non fuit sacer.* Subdea-
 ' conship in the time of the Apostles was no holy Order.

Dr. *Burns* in like manner had the same objected against him
 in the Articles for which he was burned. He give you the Ar-
 ticle, and his own sentiments concerning it, as Mr. *Fox* relates
 in a Discourse set forth with Mr. *Tyndal* and *John Fritb's*
Works.

Article 6. ' I will never believe, nor yet I can never believe,
 ' that one man may be by the Law of God a Bishop of two or
 ' three Cities, yea of an whole Countrey ; for it is contrary to
 ' Saint *Paul*, which saith ; *I have left thee behind, to set in every*
 ' *City a Bishop.* And if you find in one place of Scripture that
 ' they be called *Episcopi*, you shall find in many that they be call-
 ' ed *Presbyteri*.—I was brought before my Lord Cardinal in-
 ' to his Gallery, and there he read all my Articles till he came to
 ' this, and there he stopped, and said, That this touched him,
 ' and therefore he asked me, if I thought it wrong that one Bi-
 ' shop should have so many Cities underneath him? Unto whom
 ' I answered, That I could no farther go than to St. *Paul's* text,
 ' which set in every City a Bishop. Then asked he me, If I
 ' thought it now unright (seeing the Ordinance of the Church)
 ' that one Bishop should have so many Cities? I answered, That
 ' I knew none Ordinance of the Church (as concerning this
 ' thing) but St. *Paul's* saying only. Nevertheless I did see a con-
 ' trary custom and practise in the world, but I know not the O-
 ' riginal thereof. Then said he, That in the Apostles time there
 ' were divers Cities, some seven miles, some six miles long, and
 ' over them was there set but one Bishop, and of their Suburbs
 ' also ; so likewise now a Bishop hath also but One City to his
 Cathe-

' *Cathedral Church*, and the *Countrey* about it as *Suburbs* unto it.
 ' Methought this was far-fetcht, but I durst not deny it, because
 ' it was so great Authority, and of so holy a *Father*, and of so
 ' great a *Divine*. But this I dare say, that his Holiness could
 ' never prove it by *Scripture*, nor yet by any *Authority of Do-*
 ' *ctors*, nor yet by any practise of the *Apostles*; and yet it
 ' must be true, because a *Pillar of the Church* hath spoken it. But
 ' let us see what the *Doctors* say to mine Article. *Athanasius*
 ' doth declare this Text of the *Apostle*, *I have left thee behind*,
 ' &c. He would not commit unto one *Bishop* a whole *Ylde*, but
 ' he did injoyne that every *City* should have his proper *Pastor*, sup-
 ' posing that by this means they should more diligently oversee
 ' the people, and also that the labour should be more easie to
 ' bear, &c. Also *Chrysostome* on that same Text: He would not
 ' that a whole *Countrey* should be permitted unto one man, but
 ' he enjoined to every man his *Cure*, by that means he knew
 ' that his labour should be more easie, and the subjects should be
 ' with more diligence govern'd, if the Teachers were not di-
 ' stract with the governing of many Churches, but had cure and
 ' charge of *one Church only*, &c. Methinks these be plain words,
 ' and able to move a man to speak as much as I did. But grant
 ' that you may have all these *Cities*, yet can you make it none
 ' *Heresie*. For my Lord *Cardinal* granted that it was but against
 ' him, and against you, which be no *Gods*. But I poor man must
 ' be an *Heretick*, there is no remedy, You will have it so, and
 ' who is able to say nay? *Not all Scripture*, nor yet *God him-*
 ' *self*.

By this time the *Reader* cannot but be well satisfied, that the
 great thing aim'd at by the first great *Lights* *England* had in
Henry the 8ths days, as a most effectual way to carry on a
 Reformation, was the reducing the *Papish Hierarchy* to an *Apo-*
stolical Presbytery. The *Presbyterian Discipline*, that is, *The*
Government of Gospel-Churches by Presbyters and Deacons, being of
Divine Institution, is most admirably suited to the designed End of
 promoting the *Glory of God*, the *Power of Religion*, &c. A *Disci-*
pline, the truth of which hath been sealed by the blood of blessed
Protestant Martyrs, a thing in which our *Episcoparians* cannot
 make their boast.

Moreover 'tis manifest, that this was not only the apprehension of Tyndall, Barnes, and Lambert, but that all the Clergy in Henry the 8th's time, denied a Diocesan Episcopacy to be of Divine Institution, asserting, that in the New Testament there is no mention made but of Deacons or Ministers, and Priests or Bishops. This is in a Paper sign'd by Cromwell, and many others; Yea, and in the necessary Erudition of a Christian man, as is acknowledged by the Judicious Dr. Burnet, who in his *Addenda* to the first part of the Reformation, doth say, *That both in this Writing, and in the necessary Erudition of a Christian man, Bishops and Priests are spoken of as one and the same Office.* Though I must confess, that the Dr. doth differ from those Divines; and although he gives us not satisfaction in his Reply, yet he speaks more ingenuously, and more to the purpose, than either this Gentleman, or Dr. Stillingfleet himself.

4 The old Nonconformists in Queen Elizabeth's days agreeing with those worthy Martyrs, Tyndall, Lambert, and Barnes, concerning the most effectual way of carrying on the Reformation, applied themselves seriously to the Work. The Viciousness of some of the Clergy in Queen Elizabeth's days was as grievous unto the Nonconformist, as unto those glorious Martyrs; a Reformation in Manners, and in order thereunto in Church-Discipline, was what they aim'd at.

'Tis very evident; That a further Reformation than was carried on by Queen Elizabeth, was very desirable; for in some respects she carried it not so far as King Edward himself had done. 'For Queen Elizabeth (as Dr. Burnet most admirably expresseth it) though she had been bred up from her Infancy with a Hatred to the Papacy, and a Love to the Reformation; yet as her first Impressions in her Fathers Reign were in favour of such old Rites, as he had still retained, so in her nature she loved State and some Magnificence in Religion, as well as in every thing else: She thought that in her Brothers Reign they had stript it too much of external Ornaments, and had made their Doctrine too narrow in some Points: Therefore she intended to have some things explain'd in more general Terms, that so all Parties might be comprehended by them: She inclin'd to keep up Images in Churches, and to have the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament left in some general words, that those who believe a Corporal Presence, might not be driven

away

away from the Church by too nice an explanation of it. History of Reform. part. 2. l. 3.

As to this last Particular, the *Rubrick* that explain'd the Reason for the kneeling at the Sacrament, That thereby no Adoration is intended to any corporal presence of Christs flesh and blood, because that is only in Heaven; which had been in King Edwards Liturgy, is left out, and kneeling at the Sacrament, to many a Protestant much more offensive than formerly.

The great Propension in Queen Elizabeth's days to gain over the *Popish* party to her Communion by those Alterations made in the Liturgy in favour of the Papist, the ordering the Sacramental Bread to be made round in the fashion of the Wafers used in the time of Queen Mary, the requiring the *Table* to be placed where the *Altar* stood, &c. was attended with the *Conformity* of many, who were cordially affected to the Interest of the Church of Rome, at which time there was not a sufficient number of learned men to supply the *Cures*; which filled the Church (as Heylin saith) with an *Ignorant and Illiterate Clergy*, whose learning went no further than the Liturgy, or Book of Homilies, though otherwise conformable unto the Rules of the Church.

The Old Nonconformists still desiring a further Reformation than was carried on in King Edwards days, but finding rather a turning toward Rome, could not but be greatly grieved. They in their places wait a while, but at length humbly desire a *Parochial Discipline*, instead of which they fall under the lash of new *Impositions*, unto which they could not Conscientiously conform; hence many Learned, Judicious, Godly and Faithful Ministers are cast out, even at such a time when the Church had but a company of Illiterate Fellows to officiate in Publick. From whence proceedeth the *First Separation*, as appears from what the old Smith said in his Answer to the Bishop of London's charge, where you will find, that although they separated from the Church, because their faithful Ministers were turn'd out, yet they even then made it manifest, That they left not the Liturgy, because it contain'd Forms of Prayer, for they made use of a *Form at their Separate Meeting*. Take Smith's words in a part of the Register. 'Indeed as you said even now, for Preaching and ministring the Sacraments, so long as we might have the
' Word

' Word freely Preached, and the Sacraments administred with-
 ' out the preferring of Idolatrous gear about it, we never as-
 ' sembled together in Houses. But when it came to this point,
 ' that all our Preachers were displaced by your Law, that
 ' would not subscribe to your Apparel and your Law; so that
 ' we could not hear none of them in any Church by the space of
 ' seven or eight weeks, except Father Coverdale, of whom we
 ' have a good opinion; and yet God knows the man was so
 ' fearful, that he durst not be known unto us where he Prea-
 ' ched, though we sought it at his house. And then were we
 ' troubled and commanded to your Courts from day to day,
 ' for not coming to your Parish-Churches. Then we bethought
 ' us what were best to do; and we remembered that there was a
 ' Congregation of us in this City in Queen Marys days; and a
 ' Congregation at Geneva, which used a Book, and Order of
 ' Preaching, *Ministring of the Sacraments and Discipline, most*
 ' *agreeable to the Word of God:* which Book is allowed by that
 ' Godly and Well-learned man, Mr. Calvin, and the Preachers
 ' there, which Book and Order we now hold. And if you can
 ' reprove this Book, or any thing that we hold by the Word of
 ' God, we will yield to you, and do open Penance at Pauls
 ' Cross; if not, we will stand to it by the Grace of God.

Thus no Parochial Discipline being admitted, but those who
 desir'd it being Ejected, even at such a time, when those who
 remain'd in Publick for the most part were Illiterate and Vi-
 cious, *the Separation begun.* The Ejection of the Godly Non Con-
 formists, the Sensuality of the remaining Clergy, was a great Cause
 of the first Separation, and not without great Reason. For it be-
 ing as essential to every true Gospel-Minister, that he Govern the
 Church of which he is a Pastor, as that he teaches and instructs it;
 the taking from 'em so essential a part of their Office, which by
 woful experience has been of a very ill tendency, could not
 but occasion the Old Nonconformists to manifest their dislike to
 such proceedings, and refuse the giving in an Assent and Consent
 thereunto; for which Refusal they being Ejected, the multitude of
 such as remain'd being Illiterate, yea and Vicious in their Con-
 versations, the more sober People withdrew from the Publick,
 and run after the Ejected. The Scandals of the Clergy having
 had no inconsiderable influence on the Separation.

For which consult the Learned Dr. Burnet, who saith, *'In the Sponsions made by the Priests, they bind themselves to teach the People committed to their charge, to banish away all erroneous Doctrines, and to use both publick and private Menitions and Exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within their Cures, as need shall require, and as occasion shall be given. Such as remember that they have plighted their Faith for this to God, will feel the Pastoral Charge to be a load indeed, and so be far enough from relinquishing it, or hiring it out to a loose or ignorant Mercenary. These are the blemishes and Scandals that lye on our Church, brought on it partly by the corruption of some Simoniacal Patrons, but chiefly by the Negligence of some, and the Faultiness of other Clergy-men: Which could never have lost so much ground in the Nation, upon such trifling accounts, as are the contests since raised about Ceremonies, if it were not that the People, by such palpable faults in the Persons and behaviour of some Church-men, have been possessed with prejudices, first against them, and then upon their account against the whole Church: So that these corrupt Church-men are not only to answer to God for all those Souls within their charge, that have perished through their neglect; but in a great degree for all the mischief of the Schism among us; to the nourishing whereof they have given so great and palpable occasion.* The importance of those things, made me judge they deserved this Digression.

Having been thus large in removing the Mistakes the Dr's Substitute seem'd to lye under, let the *Sober Reader* judge, Whether 'tis any way probable, that the *Jesuits* had an hand in the first Separation; or whether the pretence about *Spiritual Prayer* was any ground of their Separation? that is, Whether they were against a Form of Prayer, crying down the *English Liturgy* with a Design of setting up Free and *Spiritual Prayer* in its stead.

S E C T. II.

The Designs of the Jesuit against a Prelatical Episcopacy, found to be none. Some Differences between the first Reformers and our Author. A Letter of Sir Francis Knolles to the Lord Treasurer Cecil, out of which 'tis prov'd, That there is a Difference between some old Queen Elizabeths Bishops, and the Dean, &c. The Author's Pretences about Antiquity confuted out of Bishop Jewel.

HIS Reply to what I offer'd to the Dean's second Argument, falls now under Consideration.

The Dean in representing the Dissenter, to the great Disadvantage of the Party, insinuates as if their opposing Prelatical Episcopacy, had been the most effectual way to cast reproach on the first Reformers, and to introduce Popery.

In Answer unto this I did *First* prove, 1. That it was not the Principle nor the Interest of the Jesuit to destroy Episcopacy. A Truth the Dean's Substitute doth not deny. 2. That the Reputation of the first Reformation is not in the least blasted by the Dissenter, which I evinc'd with so much Demonstration, that the whole that is returned by way of *Answer*, is, His not believing some of those persons, on whose Testimony I insisted, (though he gives no Reason for his Unbelief.) His proving what I granted, and his Extravagant Interpreting an Argument brought to evince, *That 'twas not the Jesuits Interest to destroy a Prelatical Episcopal Constitution, to be an admirable Address to the Lords and Commons; to pull down Bishops, and divide their Lands.* All which is done partly in his *Preface*, and partly in the first Chapter of his great Book, to shew himself an excellent *Merchandise*. But the whole is so little to the purpose, that if he had not given an occasion to enlighten the Reader concerning some momentous Instances, I would have pass'd it by as deserving no farther Consideration.

1. Every thing is said to be Misrepresented. But how the Doctor's own words should misrepresent his own sense, is not

overeasie to apprehend. However, Whether there be any Misreport, I'll leave it to the Impartial Reader, and consider what Reply is made to what I offer'd in Answer to the Doctor's *Uncomely Accusation*.

2. He grants, [p. 38.] That the *Papists* do not so much *Envy* and *Malign* the *Episcopal* Government. Neither is it their Principle nor Interest to destroy it. Why then should they be brought to act so contrary to their Principle and Interest, as to destroy what they so much endeavour to preserve, strengthen and establish? But

3. He adds, Though they are for *Episcopacy*, yet they may design the destruction of a *Protestant Episcopacy*, &c. Reply. I said, That 'twas not the *Destruction of Episcopacy*, but the *possessing themselves of our Bishopricks*, that they would be at, which may be without any alteration of the *Episcopal Constitution*, so far as 'tis *Episcopal*.

His running then unto *France* is nothing to the purpose, unless it may be looked on as an intimation of his good will to the *Arbitrary* proceedings of that Country.

However, I'll desire our Author to consider, That a *change of Persons* without any alteration of the *Episcopal Constitution*, may most effectually answer the end of the *Jesuit*. For hereby they would be capacitated (if ever a *Popish Prince* should come to the Crown) to argue with the common people concerning the *Unreasonableness of a separating from Rome*, from the same Topics with the Dean, thus.

The *Episcopacy* is not pull'd down, nor destroyed, 'tis rather strengthened, and more firmly established. There is not so vast a difference between the Church of *England*, and the Church (I do not say the Court) of *Rome*, as there is between the *Romanist* and the *Factionary Presbyterean*; behold, you have your *Bishops* still in all their *Glorious Vestments*; a *Surpliced Clergy*; an *Excellent English Liturgy* [for the *Papists* in *Dublin* have their Mass in *English*, which is exactly correspondent to the terms the *Papists* made the *English* in the days of *Archbishop Laud*] If you submit to the one, when Authority command you, why will you not to the other? What is the difference?

For this reason I cannot but be pretty confident that the *Jesuits* acting according to their own Principles and Interest, receive

ceive greatest satisfaction from such as are most deeply engag'd to represent the Episcopal Constitution as one most Excellent and Admirable.

Do not the whole Land know what 'tis that gives *life* unto *Jesuitical hopes*? What are their designs and expectations from a *Popish Successor*? and consequently how mischievous the Destruction of *Episcopacy* would prove unto that sort of People, especially at this *Juncture*? But I must not insist on this, lest I be censur'd as an *Addresser* to the *Lords* and *Commons* to pull down *Episcopacy*, a thing the *Jesuit* would not be at, he being more *unwilling*, than by argument *unable* to oppose it, for which reason (as our learned Author says) *Episcopacy* is most easily defended against a *Roman Catholick*, (*i. e.*) against one that hath no heart to oppose it. But,

4. Our Author would by all means perswade the world, that the Dissenters cast the greatest *Reproaches* on the first Reformation, because they manifest some dissatisfaction with such as impede a further Reformation; as if a good work was as soon consummated as begun; or as if it had been either *impossible* in it self, or *contrary* to the design of the *first Reformers*, to carry on the Reformation; or as if the present Constitution of *Episcopacy* had been in every momentous respect as excellent as that begun in King *Edwards* days; whereas 'tis well known unto wise men, and fully prov'd in my *Epistle* to the Reverend *Dean*, that 'twas impossible the Reformation should be finished as soon as 'twas entred on; and that the *first Reformers* in King *Edwards* days did more in six years than all their successors have since done in almost six-score. All which is prudently past over by our Author.

5. They stick much on that great *Agreement* there is between the *Present*, and King *Edwards* Reformation; as if we could not complain on the *latter*, without reproaching the *former*. But this is so *weakly* urg'd, that any *Reader* of an ordinary capacity may see the vanity of this way of arguing; for there is a great difference between *that* and *this* time; what was almost impossible then, might since be easily done. But, 2. 'tis easie to demonstrate that the begun Reformation in King *Edward* the 6ths days was more excellent than the *Present*; and that instead of carrying on the Reformation, it hath been carried

carried back, to the great grief of sound Protestants.

This hath been in part prov'd, when I did shew the Pro-
pension of Queen *Elizabeth* to favour Popery, out of Dr. *Bur-*
ner, and Dr. *Heylin*, two Sons of the Church; though I fear
the mentioning of the latter in Conjunction with the former,
may not be so meet; the former being a through Protestant,
a man of great Worth; but the heart of the latter towards
Rome; for which reason, as their Principles are vastly diffe-
rent, so should they be kept at a distance by me, if *Heylin*
had not acknowledged that to be a truth, which I rather be-
lieve, because found in the incomparable Dr. *Burnet*.

Ile now take notice of another considerable difference, be-
tween the very Constitution of *Episcopacy* in King *Edward* the
6th's time, and that in *Queen Elizabeth*: The former was
such as was inconsistent with the *Pope's* Supremacy; for they
were to hold all their Courts in the Kings Name; but the
latter, such as is most easily reduc'd to the exalting the Court of
Rome. The Government of the Church being taken from the
Prince, 'tis not so difficult to fix it on the *Pope*.

Thus there is a difference between King *Edwards*, and Queen
Elizabeth's *Episcopacies*. I may also add,

That there is a great difference between the present Con-
stitution, and that in Queen *Elizabeth*, if we may believe the
Lord Treasurer *Cecil*, who suggests, that the Bishops did not
look on their Superiority above their Brethren, to be of Divine
Right, as the Dean of *Pauls*, and his Substitute now do: For
this I will give you an account we have of the Speeches used in
the Parliament by Sir Francis *Knolles*, and after Written to my
Lord Treasurer, Sir William *Cecil*, as I find it in the end of the
Assertion.

'To the end I may inform your Lordship of my dealing in
'this Parliament-time, against the undue claimed Superiority of the
'Bishops over their Inferior Brethren: Thus it was,

'Because I was in the Parliament-time, in the 25th year of
'King *Henry* the 8th, in which time, first all the Clergy, as
'well Bishops as others, made an humble Submission to King
'*Henry* the 8th, acknowledging his Supremacy, and detest-
'ing the Usurpation of the Bishop of *Rome's* Authority: Up-
'on which Submission of the Clergy, the King gave unto
the

' the said Bishops the same ample Rule, that before they had
 ' under the Pope, over their Inferior Brethren; saving that
 ' the same Rule was abridg'd by Statute, by this Parenthe-
 ' sis following, that is to say (without offending the Prero-
 ' gative Royal of the Crown of *England*, and the Laws and
 ' Customs of the Realm) in the latter end of the Statute it
 ' was added, That whosoever offendeth in any one part of
 ' that Statute, and their Aiders, Counsellors, and Abettors,
 ' they did all fall into the penalty of the *Præmunire*. And
 ' after I had recited this Statute in the Parliament-House, I
 ' declared, that in King *Henry* the 8th's days, after this, there
 ' was no Bishop that did practise Superiority over the Infe-
 ' rior Brethren. And in King *Edward*'s days the said Bishops
 ' obtained a Statute, whereby they were Authorized to keep
 ' their Courts in the Kings Name: the which Statute was
 ' repealed in Queen *Maries* days, and was not revived in
 ' her Majesties time that now is; whereupon it was doubt-
 ' ful to me, by what Authority the Bishops do keep their
 ' Courts now in their own Names, because it is against the
 ' Prerogative Royal of the Crown of *England*, that any should
 ' keep a Court without sufficient Warrant from the Crown:
 ' Whereupon I was answered, that the Bishops do keep their
 ' Courts now by Prescriptions; and it is true, that the Bi-
 ' shops may Prescribe, that King *Henry* the 8th gave them
 ' Authority by the Statute of the 25th of his Reign, to have
 ' Authority and Rule over their Inferior Brethren, as ample
 ' as they had in the Popes time: For this was no special
 ' Warrant for them to keep their Courts by, and that in
 ' their own Names. And yet they have none other War-
 ' rant to keep their Courts (as they do now in their own
 ' Names) to my knowledg. And this was the Cause that
 ' made them obtain a Statute in King *Edward*'s days, to keep
 ' their Courts by, in the Kings Name. Now it is a strange
 ' Allegation, that the Bishops should claim Authority at this
 ' present, to keep their Courts in their own Names (as they
 ' do) by Prescription, because the Statute of 25. doth re-
 ' strain them generally from offending of the Prerogative Roy-
 ' al of the Crown of *England*, and the Laws and Customs of
 ' the Realm. And no man may justly keep a Court with-

out a special Warrant from the Crown of *England*, as is aforesaid. And the general Liberty given by King *Henry* the 8th to the Bishops, to Rule and Govern as they did in the Popes time, is no sufficient Warrant to the Bishops, to keep their own Courts in their own Names by Prescription, as I take it: And therefore the Bishops had done wisely, if they had sought a Warrant by Statute, to keep their Courts in the Queens Name, as the Bishops did in King *Edward's* days: in which time Archbishop *Cranmer* did cause *Peter Martyr* and *Bucer* to come over into this Realm, to be placed in the Two Universities, for the better Instruction of the Universities in the Word of God. And Bishop *Cranmer* did humbly prefer these Learned men without any challenge to himself of any Superior Rule in this behalf, over his Inferior Brethren. And the time hath been, that no man could carry away any Grant from the Crown of *England* by general words, but that he must have special words to carry the same by: Therefore now the Bishops are Warranted to carry away the keeping of their Courts in their own Names, by Prescription, it passeth my understanding.

Moreover, whereas your Lordship said unto me, *that the Bishops have forsaken their claim of Superiority over their inferior Brethren (lately), to be by Gods Ordinance, and that now they do only claim Superiority from her Majesties Supreme Government.* If this be true, then 'tis requisite, and necessary, that my Lord of *Canterbury* that now is, do recant, and retract his saying in his Book of the great Volume against *Cartwright*, where he saith in plain words (by the name of *Dr. Whitgift*), that the Superiority of Bishops is Gods own Institution: which saying doth impugn her Majesties Supreme Government directly; and therefore it is to be retracted plainly and truly. For Christ truly and plainly confesses, *John* 18. 36. That his Kingdom was not of this world; and therefore he gave no worldly Rule or Preheminence to his Apostles; but the Heavenly Rule, which was to Preach the Gospel, saying, *Ite, prædicate in omnem mundum; Quicumque crediderit & baptizatus fuerit, salvus erit: qui non crediderit, condemnabitur:* Go and Preach in all the world, whosoever shall believe and be baptized, shall be saved; but he that will not believe, shall be condemned, *Mar.* 16. 16.

But

‘ But the Bishops do cry out, saying, That *Cartwright* and his
 ‘ Fellows would have no Government, &c. So belike the Bi-
 ‘ shops care for no Government, but for worldly and forcible
 ‘ Government over their Brethren, the which Christ never gave
 ‘ to his Disciples nor Apostles, but made them subject to the
 ‘ Rule of Princes, who ought not to be resisted, saving that they
 ‘ might answer unto Princes, that they must rather obey God
 ‘ than men, *Act. 5. 29.* And yet in no wise to resist the Prince,
 ‘ but to take up the Cross and follow Christ. So far Sir *Francis*
Knolles Discourse in Parliament concerning the *Episcopacy*, &c.

But to return: I would fain know, why we may not think
 banquably of good beginnings, even when we cannot approve of
 such as put a stop thereunto? Is the *Episcopacy* of King *Edward*
 so much the same in all respects with the present, that who-
 ever dissents from this, must thereby cast a reproach on that?
 Surely the *Dean* won’t say so, after so many Months conside-
 ration.

6. There is an admirable distinction insisted on, which will
 bring off the *Dean* without all doubt, viz. There is a *Popish* and
 a *Protestant* *Episcopacy*: But where lies the Difference? What
 Difference is there between our present *Episcopacy*, and that
 in *Henry* the 8th time?

Is not the *Episcopacy*, so far as ’tis an *Episcopacy*, the same?
 What is there *Intrinsic* to this *Episcopal* Constitution, that differs
 from that? Whence if that be *Popish*, why may not this, see-
 ing ’tis the same with that, be in like manner so? That *Henry*
 the 8th *Episcopacy* was *Popish*, *Bishop Bramhall* hath evinced, in
 proving, that the *Papists* begun the Separation from *Rome*. In
 fine, Let our Author tell me the Difference between Queen *Mary*
Episcopacy and Queen *Elizabeth*’s *Episcopacy* on her first en-
 tering the Throne. Is not the *Episcopacy* now the same with
 that at the Reforming the Liturgy by Act of Parliament? and
 was not that *Episcopacy* the same with Queen *Mary*’s? The
 only specifying Difference that can be suggested is, that though
 the *Episcopacy* as such, is the same, and the Persons in both may
 be the same, yea and their Principles, for so it hath been in King
Henry the 8th, King *Edward* the 6th, Queen *Mary*, and Queen
Elizabeth; yet the outward profession of the Bishops is not the
 same. But is this *Extrinsic* Consideration sufficient to occasion

a Difference that is *Intrinsic*? Moreover, to return to his *French Monarch*; Hath not the Experience of many a year assured us, That when *Monarchs* design not the enlarging their own *Monarchies*, they have done all they could to preserve other *Monarchies*? An *Aristocracy*, or a *Democracy*, being things detestable in their eye.

7. His answering the Letter of the Council by transcribing part of Sir *Francis Walsingham's* Letter, as recorded in Dr. *Burnet*, being little to the purpose, might have escaped my Consideration, had it not been very necessary to suggest, *How prudently* he overlook'd the great Principles on which the *Queen* grounded her proceedings; the one being, *That Consciences cannot be forced, but to be won and reduced by force of Truth, with the aid of time, and use of all good means of Instruction, and Persuasion.* A Principle unto which if our Clergy would adhere, it might have conduced very much to the Peace of the Church. This I suppose is a sufficient Reply to the *Dean's* Substitute.

The Dissenters oppose Episcopacy and Ceremonies, notwithstanding their Antiquity, &c. The Doctor's Argument was here set forth to the greatest advantage of his Cause in his own words. To which I reply'd, *That our not embracing Episcopacy, &c. does not advantage the Papist, neither doth our rejecting it, even when it pretends to so much Antiquity.* I having shewn that there was no such strength in their Argument of Antiquity, if it fell short of an *Absolutely Primitive* or an *Apostolical Antiquity*, as theirs really doth; they not being able to shew in what part of the *Scriptures* their *Diocesan Episcopacy* is found, it being consider'd as a Creature of Human make, by many a Son of the Church, yea and once by our great Doctor himself; and it hath been prov'd by other hands unanswerably, *That there is no evidence for such an Episcopacy in the Church the first two hundred years; for which reason Mr. Chillingworth's Argument, shewing the vanity of such mens pretences about Antiquity, that can ascend no higher than the fifth, or fourth, or third, or second Age, is, it may be, as pertinently urg'd, as the little intimation of Mr. Ch's sense of the Antiquity of Episcopacy.* 'Tis pleasant then to see with what pertness our Author hopes, that our Enquirer will now grow so modest, as not to cite Mr. *Chil.* any more against an Argument from Antiquity.

The

The other part of his Reply is as little to the purpose, unless a declaiming against *Protestant* Arguments, such as are too strong to receive an Answer, be the most effectual way to ruine *Poper*y. 'Tis true, we reject the *Popish* pretences about *Antiquity* as *frivolous*; many *Protestants* (in the number of which some Nonconformists may be listed) having unanswerably proved *Poper*y to be a *Novelty*.

However, If *Poper*y or *Episcopacy* be not agreeable to the Scriptures, whatever their pretences are to *Antiquity*, they will be found unworthy the consideration of a solid *Divine*; and therefore because he sends me to Bishop *Jewel*, [Part 1. p. mibi, 539, &c.] I'll give the Reader an account of his sense against *Harding*. *The Truth of God* (saith the Bishop) *is neither further'd by the Face of Antiquity, nor hinder'd by the Opinion of Novelty. For oftentimes the thing that is New is condemned as Old; and the thing that is indeed Old is condemned as New. If Newness in Religion, in all respects, and every way, were ill, Christ would not have resembled his Doctrine to New Wine, &c. Arnobius saith, The Authority of Religion must be weighed by God, and not by Time. It becometh us to consider not upon what day, but what things we begin to Worship.* — The thing that is true, is never too late. *Saint Augustine* saies, *The Heathen say, The Religion that was First, cannot be False; as if Antiquity and old Custom could prevail against the Truth.* The old Learned Father *Tertullian* saies, *Whatever thing savoureth against the Truth, the same is an Heresie, yea although it be a Custom never so Old, &c.*

This surely is the *Protestant* Doctrine; whence to talk of *Antiquity*, in order to the countenancing *that* in Religion, which finds no favour from the Scriptures, is but to advance the *Papal* Interest; who have but little beside the pretence of *Antiquity* to support their Abominations.

SECT. III.

A search for the Schismatick. A true state of the Difference between the Church of England and the Protestant Dissenter. The Dissenter, according to our Author's Notion, clear'd from Schisme. The

Church of England found Guilty. Some Remarks on several other passages in the Dean's Defence. An Account of some of the Dean's Mistakes. The Dissenter no friend to Popery. The Conclusion.

1. **T**HAT our *Divisions* advance the *Popish Designs*, is acknowledged. But the 2. Enquiry is, *Who is the Faulty Divider?* It being the Faulty Divider alone who gives the *Papist* the advantage. The great Enquiry then must be after the *Faulty Divider*, *Whether the Conformist, or the Nonconformist be the Divider?*

The state of the Case was given in the *Enquiry*, [p. 13.] where the Principle on which the Dissenters proceed was laid down, and improv'd; this should have been consider'd by our *Author*, but he was so prudent as to pass it by: For which Reason, without any Reflections on my Learned Adversary, I must mind him of the *state of the Controversie*, and shew wherein he hath exercised his Wisdom in leaping over what he could not handsomly remove out of the way.

In the *Enquiry* after the *Faulty Divider*, I shewed wherein the Parties at variance agreed, and wherein they differ'd. 1. They agreed in those Points commonly called *Doctrinal* or *Substantial*, in contradistinction to *lesser things*, about *Worship* and *Church-Discipline*, &c. They differ'd about what was in the Judgment of the Dissenter *Sinful*; but in the Opinion of the Episcopal, only *Indifferent*.

'Tis true, the *Episcopal* represent us as a weak People, whose Consciences as to those particulars are *Erroneous*; that therefore we must cast off these erring Consciences, and submit.

Our *Reply* is, We seek Heaven for Counsel, we study hard for the Truth, read with the greatest Impartiality and Freedom the Discourses the *Episcopal* have written; For we can solemnly and with much sincerity declare, as in the presence of an Heart-searching God, We would with the greatest cheerfulness Conform to all the *Impositions*, if we thought we could do it without sin. That we are so *perish* as to lose the Comforts of a good Benefice, merely to gratifie an obstinate Humour; if we are in danger of being bial'd one way more than another by carnal

carual considerations, 'tis *towards Conformity*. For if we conform, we are freed from the reproaches and contempt of many, from the continued fear of Imprisonment, and other uncomfortable severities, and in a fair way of abounding with the good things of this life for the supporting our selves and Families. But if we conform not, we are represented as *Factions* and *Seditious*, expos'd to the Rage of every vile *Informer*, in constant danger of Fines, &c. and of more miseries than I can with delight rehearse.

However, though there are considerations enough from the world to byas our minds, in a seeking for the Truth, to lean *towards Conformity*; yet desiring to approve our selves sincere *towards God*, we find, *That we cannot without sin conform*; we cannot without sinning deliberately, and knowingly comply with the *Episcopal Impositions*; and if we should notwithstanding conform to live and die Conformists, we should knowingly, and deliberately sin, yea, and die under the *guilt* thereof, which is a thing so hazardous to the soul, that we durst not touch with Conformity, lest we die, lest we die eternally.

We censure not such as do conform, because they not lying under the *same convictions* of Conscience as we do, may not by their Conformity run that hazard, which we unavoidably must, should we against the *light of our Consciences* comply. There is a great difference between those that act according to the directions of their Consciences, and such as act contrary thereunto: For which reason I wonder, that our great *Church-men* should say, that Mr. Baxter represented all *Conformists* as a company of *Perjured Villains*, merely because he shew'd, that if the Nonconformists should contrary to the Dictates of their Conscience conform, they should be guilty of *Perjury*, and several other great sins.

But though this be the truth, yet there are some who will not believe it, who say we, do we what we can for their satisfaction, will count us a *pack of Hypocrites*. For which reason, that I might anticipate the censure, I laid down the *Principle* unto which Dissenters do most firmly adhere, the discussing which is what they do most sincerely desire.

The Principle is this, *That the word of God contained in Scripture, is the only Rule of the Whole, and of every part of true Religion.*

gion. As for *external circumstances*, as *time and place, &c.* being no part of, though necessary appendages unto our Religion.

From this Principle I proceed to this Conclusion, *That whatever part of the Service of the Church of England is impos'd on us, as so necessary a part of our Religion, as to be a term of Communion, if not agreeable to the word of God in Scripture, that Imposition is sinful.*

Our Adversary considers, that such as live in *England*, and yet are not of the Church of *England*, do not belong unto the Catholick Church; that is; they are all in a state of damnation. Hence 'tis we must, according unto him, be a member of the Church of *England*, or be damned. We are willing with all our hearts to be members of the same Church with them, *i. e.* to be members of the Catholick Church is what we desire. But this, say they, we cannot be, but by complying with their imposed terms. To which we reply, Let their terms be as Catholick as they pretend their Church is, and we'll comply: *i. e.* Let them keep to a few, certain, and necessary things; let them not impose as terms of Union, any thing but what is according to the Word of God in Scripture, we are satisfied; the Controversie is at an end. But if they will take on 'em to make that a part of true Religion, yea so necessary a part, as to make it a term of our communion with the Catholick Church, 'tis a sinful encroachment on the Prerogative of the Lord Jesus Christ, with which we dare not comply.

* Si objiciant
in sacris literis
non haberi In-
vocandos esse
Sanctos, vene-
randas Imagi-
nes, abstinendum
à Carnibus, aut
aliquid ejusmo-
di; non ergo
ista esse faci-
enda: nos con-
tra objiciamus
Et quidem Effi-
cacious: Hac
Sacris Literis
non Prohiberi,
atque sine pec-
cato fieri posse;
quia ubi non est
Lex ibi nec pra-
varicatio. *Cosl.*
Inflit. christ.
l. 2. c. 1.

If they expect our compliance, why do they not shew the Scriptures that declare the things they impose, to be so necessary a part of true Religion, as to be a form of our communion with the Catholick Church? They must not only shew that those things are agreeable to true Religion, but moreover that they are so necessary a part thereof, that whoever conforms not to them when impos'd, is *ipso facto* cut off from the Catholick Church. This they can never do, and therefore can never clear themselves from being the faulty dividers.

When we provoke 'em to shew us what Scriptures direct them to their Impositions, we are turn'd off with *Where is it forbidden?* as if they had acted exactly to the Rule * *Costerus* the Jesuit gave his young Scholars, *if any object, Where are those points, viz. The Invocation of Saints, The worshipping of Images, The abstaining from flesh,*

flesh, and the like; found in Scripture; and because not found in Scripture, therefore to be rejected. To which, saith the Jesuit, answer thus: Ask where 'tis forbidden in Scripture? if not forbidden in Scripture, 'tis no sin to observe 'em; for where there is no Law, there is no transgression. So far *Cosermus*.

To whom we rejoyn, That the holy Scriptures being the only Rule of the Whole, and of Every part of true Religion, if these things be not according to the Scripture, 'tis because there is no truth in 'em. There must be an exact correspondency and agreeableness between the Rule and its Regulate. The Regulate must be brought to the Rule, and if it doth not agree with it, 'tis because the Regulate is not Right. The word of God in Scripture is the Rule, what Religion soever varies from the Rule, 'tis a false Religion. *Rectum est Index sui & obliqui*.

There are some Religions are larger than the Rule. There are other Religions that fall short of the Rule. They who embrace any Notion as a part of their Religion, which is not to be found in Scripture, is too large for the Scripture; and such as reject what the Scripture enjoins, have a Religion too short. The one puts the Scripture on the Rack, to stretch it to their Religion; but the other pares off a considerable part of Scripture, that the Rule may not exceed their Religion. But such as keep exactly to the word of God in Scripture, who neither go beyond, nor fall short of it, are in the right.

To make that a part of our Religion which is not to be found in Scripture, is to take that for a part of our Religion which God hath not made a part thereof, which is sinful. How much more so is the making it a term of communion?

That the things in controversy between the Church and the Dissenter, are not to be found in Scripture, and consequently are no part of true Religion, is evident; not only because we can't understand where 'tis to be found, nor because the Churchmen cannot direct us where to find it; but because they themselves look on 'em as indifferent, *i. e.* as what is not enjoined us in the word of God, *q. d.* as what is not according to the word of God.

All this being most plain and obvious to an ordinary Capacity that is not biased by Prejudice, &c. Let the world judge who is in the *FAULT*. They who keep close to Scripture, or
they

they who recede therefrom. They who will do any thing, but Sin, for Peace; Or they who will exercise their Authority, and impose unnecessary things with the greatest Violence imaginable: I say, with the greatest Violence imaginable; for they are impos'd with such a severe Threatning annex'd, that whoever refuses a compliance, is cut off from the Catholick Church, and given over to the Devil. Hence 'tis, that they imposing Indifferent things as necessary to Salvation, do according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* own Rule, declare themselves to be the *Schismatical Dividers*.

I say, according to Dr. *Stillingfleet's* own Rule, compar'd with his *Substrates* Notion. In the Doctor's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 213. he saith, That there are three Cases wherein the Scripture allow of Separation. The last of which is, *When men make things Indifferent Necessary to Salvation, and divide the Church upon that account; and this was the Case of the false Apostles, who urged the Ceremonies of the Law, as necessary to Salvation.*—Now although St. Paul himself complied sometimes with the practice of them. — Yet when these false Apostles came to enforce the Observation of them as necessary to Salvation, then he bids the Christians at Philippi to beware of them; i.e. To fly their Communion, and have nothing to do with them.

From this Rule of Dr. *Stillingfleet* it must follow, That if the Church of England make things Indifferent Necessary to Salvation, our Separation from the Church is allowed by the Scriptures; yea commanded and enjoyned. We must beware of 'em, (i.e.) to fly their Communion, and have nothing to do with them. But that things Indifferent are made necessary by the Church of England, according to his Doctrine, doth appear irrefragably.

That which is Necessary to our Communion with the Catholick Church, is, according to his Doctrine, necessary to Salvation. But Indifferent things are Necessary to our Communion with the Church of England, which is One with the Communion with the Catholick Church; in that, according to him, they are made necessary to our Communion with the Church of England, which is One with the Communion with the Catholique Church, according to his constant Judgment. Ergo.

Or in other Terms, Whatever is made necessary to our being

ing Members of the *Catholic Church*, is made necessary to Salvation ; for to be Members of the *Catholic Church*, and to be in a state of Salvation , is the same ; and to be Members of the particular *Church of England* , and Members of the *Catholic Church* is one and the same with our Author, [p. 248.] As if it had been said, To be Members of the *Church of England*, is to be in a state of Salvation ; but not to be Members of the *Church of England*, is to be out of a state of Salvation. Whence what is made necessary to our being Members of the *Church of England*, is made necessary to our Salvation ; that is, *The many indifferent Ceremonies impos'd, as terms of our Communion with the Church of England, are made necessary for Salvation*, according to our Author.

For which reason *the Scripture* allows our Separation, yea the *Scripture* bids us beware of her, that is, to fly her Communion, and have nothing to do with her. Thus the *Doctor* in conjunction with his *Substitute* furnishes us with an unanswerable Argument to clear the Dissenter from the odious Sin of *Schism*, which in short is this ;

From such as make Indifferent things Necessary to Salvation, we must Separate. This is Dr. Stillingfleet's.

But the *Church of England* makes Indifferent things necessary to Salvation. This is the Dr's Substitutes Notion.

Ergo, We may, yea we must Separate ; that is, 'Tis the Will of God we should Separate, or 'tis our Duty, and therefore not our Sin to separate ; (i. e.) We are not the *Schismatics*.

This is *Argumentum ad Hominem* ; and either this Author must quit his Doctrine, or acquit us of *Schisme*.

But to treat our Author with the greater Civility, we'll suppose him to be so tenacious of his own Doctrine, that he'll rather discharge us of *Schisme* than abandon his beloved Notions ; for which reason, seeing 'tis on all sides acknowledged that there is a Faulty Division among us, and consequently a *Faulty Divider*, who is the *Schismarick* ; He must be either the Dissenter, or the Conformist ; but not the *Dissenter*, as we have already prov'd from our Author's own *Topics* ; Ergo, the Conformist. Here we might have put an end to this Discourse, and would do so, had not our Author's fertile Brain furnish'd us with another Argument, that doth as fully evince the *Conformist*

to be the *Schismatick*, as the former clear'd the *Dissenter*.

In the management of this Argument, we'll consider the *Notion* of Dr. Peter Gunning and Peirson, as compared with our Author.

The Learned G. and P. in a *Conference with the Papists*, assert, *That a Superiours unjust casting any out of the Church, is Schismatical*. If the Governours of the Church do by sinful Impositions, or unjust Excommunications cast any out of the Church, they are *Schismatical*. This our Author won't deny.

But according to his Notion, The Church of England are guilty of such Impositions, and do unjustly Excommunicate Dissenters.

1. That the Impositions are sinful is evident, in that Indifferent things (as has been prov'd) are made necessary to Salvation. The making any Indifferent thing Necessary to Salvation, is sinful. But the imposing indifferent things as terms of *Catholic* Communion, is the making such things Necessary to Salvation. Ergo, Sinful. Ergo, The Imposer is Schismatical. But

2. Whoever doth unjustly Excommunicate any, are Schismatical. This is Dr. Gunning's sense. But the Church of England (if they agree with our Author) Excommunicates the Dissenter unjustly. Ergo, &c.

That the Church of England Excommunicates unjustly, according to the Doctrine of our Author, is demonstrable; even in that the Church doth, as he would have it, by Excommunication cast thousands out of a state of Salvation, for not complying with little uncommanded things. Whence I argue thus, To Excommunicate, or cast us out of a state of Salvation, merely because we cannot comply with what God never commanded us, is to Excommunicate unjustly: But so doth the Church of England, if we may pass a censure on her as our Author provokes us to do; for the Church according unto him doth Excommunicate, that is, shut Heaven-gates against such to whom our Lord Jesus Christ hath promised the opening them.

To illustrate this with the greater clearness, I beseech the Reader to consider, That Salvation is promised by Jesus Christ unto all such as do sincerely Believe, truly Repent, and lead an Holy Life in all Godliness and Honesty. Though a man may be daily guilty of lesser Evils, yet if he believe in Christ, and

and renders sincere Obedience to the known Will of God, he shall be saved. All which may be, even with those, who being verily perswaded that their compliances with the present Impositions are sinful, durst not Conform; that is, *The Promise of Salvation is made by Christ to many, who do not conform to the Impositions of the Church of England.* But Salvation by our Author is denied unto such, their Non-compliance is enough to make them *Schismatical*, to cut them off from Christ, and the hopes of Salvation, which being no ways justifiable in the Conscience of any sober man, the *Dissenters* are unjustly Excommunicated; and he that so Excommunicates, is *Schismatical*.

'Tis most certain, That many good Christians cannot conform to the imposed terms of Communion with the Church, and that for this single Reason they are Excommunicable, if not actually Excommunicated from the Church; that is, put out of a state of Salvation. The which being so, 'twill unavoidably follow, That either the Excommunication is unjust; or, That the Church hath greater Power, than he that is the Lord of it, to open and shut the gates of Heaven. If the latter, then the Church sets itself up above all that is called God in this world, and Christ in the other. For whereas Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, is sufficient for our Salvation; these add somewhat more, to wit, an Obedience to new Impositions, threatening the neglect with Damnation. But if the former, if the Excommunication is unjust, then according to Dr. Gunning, with the addition of our Author, *Our Ecclesiastical Governours are the Schismatics.* The Argument here in short is this;

He that doth unjustly Excommunicate any out of the Catholic Church, is a Schismatick. This is Dr. Gunning's.

But the Church of England, shutting those out of Salvation to whom Christ hath promised it, Excommunicates unjustly. This is our Authors.

Therefore the Church of England, according to the Position of our Author, is the Schismatick.

Hereby we may easily perceive, what an admirable Defender the Church of England hath, in the Defender of the Dean; and how little the true Protestants Clergy of the Church are beholding to this man, who insists on such Notions as do necessarily lead judicious men to conclude the Church of England Schismatical.

But to return to our Author, who leaping over all the difficulties, though but hinted in the *Enquiry*, runs unto another Question, viz. *From Ceremonies to Circumstances*; from the *Parts of their Religion*, to the *external Appendages* thereunto, confounding the one with the other, and then runs triumphantly, assuring his *Reader*, That 'tis impossible to worship God, or exercise any act of Religion, but it must be in *some time*, or in *some place*; it must be done in *some circumstances*, therefore we may make some things a part of our Religion, which God has not. At this rate he fills up a great part of his *Second Chapter*. Insisting on nothing but what had its answer in that *Enquiry* he attempted to confute. Therefore if I should say no more than what I have in giving the true state of the Controversie, it would be sufficient: For it lies on him either to prove to our *Conviction*, that *We may without sin comply with their Impositions*, (i.e.) He must so far effectually enlighten our Conscience, as to help us to see, that the *Impositions* are not sinful, and that we may lawfully Conform; or shew, *That we must Conform contrary to the Convictions of our Consciences, and render a blind Obedience unto their Commands*, Believing as the Church believes; or they ought to remove the *Impositions*, or acknowledge that our *Compliances* are not sinful. One of these must be done. Let him do either, and the Controversie will be ended, and the Dissenters freed from *Schisme*. But if he cannot enlighten us to see the Lawfulness of their *Impositions*, nor persuade us to render a blind Obedience, nor remove the *Impositions*, but plead for their continuance, 'twill appear, That they by imposing what in their *Judgments* is but *Indifferent*, as things necessary to our *Salvation*, are the *Schismatics*. This might suffice as a full Answer.

- But that nothing may escape consideration; that our Author may think deserves it, Ple reflect a little on his main strength. If there be any force in this Argument (says he) it consists in these two things: First, *That all things which are in their own nature indifferent, may without sin be parted with*. And secondly, *That the Opinion of Dissenters, That indifferent things are unlawful in the worship of God, is a just reason for parting with them*: For if it be not lawful to part with every thing that is indifferent, those who retain the use of some indifferent things, cannot meerly upon that account be called *Dividers* or *Schismatics*; and if the opinion of Dissenters that

all

all indifferent things are unlawful, be not a sufficient reason for parting with them, then there may be no fault in the Episcopal will not, nor a sufficient justification or excuse in the Dissenters cannot. p. 9.

First, saith he, If there be any force in this Argument, it consists in two things: First, That all things which are in their own nature indifferent, may without sin be parted with. This is his mistake; he should have said, That if there be any strength in the Enquiry, it lyes in this, viz. No one indifferent Ceremony must be made so necessary a part of Religion, as to be a term of Communion. 'Tis this he should have considered. For you sin by insisting on any one, or more indifferent things so zealously as to make 'em terms of Communion with your Church, and consequently with the Church Catholick; so as to deny us a right to Christ and Salvation, for a mere non-compliance. You can part with your indifferent Ceremonies without sin, and open the door of Salvation to the wretched Dissenter if you will, even when they cannot without sin comply with your intolerable Impositions. The indifferent things you impose, you impose as terms of our Communion with you, which you make to be the same with Catholick Communion, that is of Salvation.

2. You add the second thing, viz. That the Opinion of Dissenters, That Indifferent things are unlawful, is a just reason for parting with them. For if it be not, say you, lawful to part with every thing that is indifferent; those who retain the use of Indifferent things, cannot merely upon that account be called Dividers, or Schismatics, &c.

You should remember, that I distinguished between Ceremonies and Circumstances, between what is a part of Religion, and Intrinsicall thereunto, and what is Extrinsicall only: But you run to external Circumstances that are necessary in *Theſis*, which is off from the point in hand.

You run from what is Indifferent to what is Necessary, as if we called you to part with any necessary thing; whereas there is never any indifferent Ceremony that is grievous to our Consciences, but you may part with, or cease to impose 'em, and yet worship God. But to divide necessary circumstances of Action from the Action, is impossible. A thing we no way desire.

'Tis true as you assert, *A man who is to remove from London*

to York, is not bound either to go thither on foot, or on horseback, or in a Coach, or in a Waggon, each of these ways are in themselves indifferent; but yet if he will travel to York, he must use one or other of these ways of Motion; not one in particular is necessary, yet one or other is. But what is this to our purpose? What though the Partition-wall between Ceremonies and Circumstances be broken down, and they all mingled together, and all must be consider'd alike but as Circumstances, What will this help you? To keep to your pretty Allusion with one necessary Addition, viz. One hath not strength to walk on foot from London to York, another cannot bear the riding in Coach, yet to York they must go. If you'll keep to the point before us, you must say to the person that can't walk to York, Some way of Motion is necessary to your going to York, if you'll go thither; therefore you shall walk, or not go thither: And to the other that can't ride in a Coach, if you'll not go thither in a Coach, you shall not go at all; and yet give him the Strapado for not going thither.

This is the Case; and how easily may they reply unto you on your calling them to hasten to York on these impossible terms, or to the Bishops Colehouse? We would go to York with all our heart on Horseback, or in a Waggon; but to walk or to ride in a Coach we cannot. You can give us leave to go thither on horseback, if you will, but you will not; we would go, but go in Coach, or walk, we cannot. Here is a division, your will not, and our cannot; who now is in fault? That they cannot, is evident because of weakness; and Infirmary of body; That you can permit 'em to go on Horseback, is as unquestionable; but yet you will not.

Thus we have the strength of our Author's Reply; You must get into the visible Catholick Church, or to prison; and you cannot get in, but you must either use some external circumstances in some time, or in some place, &c. therefore this time, or no time; this place or no place. Sir, by your good favour, as you acknowledg this or the other particular circumstance to be indifferent, and that other circumstances may be chosen, if not this; to make either of these indifferent circumstances a necessary term of communion, is sinful and schismatical. To make of a little thing so great a bar to shut thousands out of heaven, is what you will never be able to answer when you shall appear before the Tribunal of a righteous God.

But

But as to the true state of the Controversie, 'tis another thing; you make *that a part of Religion which God hath not made*; you impose *uninstituted* ceremonies, and in many things recede from the *Apostolical Institution*, and call on us on pain of damnation to comply with you. We must comply, or be cut off from the Catholick Church, even from the body of Christ, from all hopes of salvation.

These things being thus plain, I'll gratifie our Authors desire in considering his Logick. *If the Dissenters can without sin (says he) obey their Governours in indifferent, that is, in lawful things, but will not; and the Episcopal would be content to part with indifferent things for union, but cannot, who is the Divider? What must be done for Union? Must the Dissenters comply in things where-in they can without sin; or must the Episcopal sin and lose their peace with God for Union?* p. 29.

This is called by our Author an Argument, but why, I cannot imagine; however let it be so, wherein lies its strength, or how comes it to pass, that this cannot be answered; without a shewing *Sophistry* to be where 'tis not?

If there be any force in this Argument, it must be either in this, viz. *That the Impositions are in the judgment of the Dissenters Lawful, or Indifferent*, which may be submitted unto without sin. Had this suggestion been true, we would grant him the whole he desires, viz. *That the Dissenters refusing to do what is Lawful in their own judgment to be done for Union, they are Faulty*. But 'tis notorious, *That the imposed terms are of such a nature, that they cannot be submitted unto by the Dissenter, but he must grievously offend the most high God, to the wounding his own conscience*.

If its strength lyes not there, it must in this, *That the Episcopal would be content to part with indifferent things, but cannot*. And why can they not? What is the matter that they cannot part with *toys and trifles* to take many a thousand within the pale of the Church, and thereby help 'em to Heaven? The things are still supposed indifferent by our Author, and therefore a parting with 'em is not contrary to any Law, nor *sinful*. Why then can they not without sin part with, what they can part with without sin? This is surely mysterious! They cannot part with that without sin, which they can part with without sin, and yet

yet will not part with it, though according to their own judgment their not parting with their indifferent things tends to the unavoidable destruction of souls. They know the Dissenters, unless these indifferent things be past by, must be kept out of the Church of *England*, that is, out of the *Catholick Church* say they, and remain to the last hour of their life in a state of damnation. Whence then did I say, *What must must be done for Union?* I may now say, *What must be done to save the thousands of Souls for whom Christ died?* Must the *Episcopal* part with what they can without sin, and take the Dissenters into the *Catholique Church*, and thereby save their Souls; or must the *Dissenters* sin that they may be saved? What, Is there no way to Heaven for *English* Dissenters, but their complying with *sinful* Impositions? 'Twas said in the Apostles days, that *We must not do evil, that good may come thereof.* Then surely, if we will be of the Apostles judgment, *We must not sin, to save our Souls.* Our *Unrighteousness* doth not, cannot commend the *Righteousness* of God. But

Before I dismiss this Point, that the Reader may be fully satisfied that I abuse not our Author, I must beseech him to consider;

1. That our *Author* hath, in a way different from the greatest, or rather the better part of the Clergy, asserted, That our not holding external communion with the Church of *England*, is a cutting our selves off from the *Catholick Church*, a putting our selves out of the Way of Salvation. This is the main scope of his discourse. A notion concerning which Dr. *Stillingfleet's* thoughts are desired.

2. That notwithstanding the absolute necessity there is of the Dissenters returning to the Church of *England*, that they may become members of the Universal Church, and be sav'd, they will not part with any of those things that are in their own judgment little, though it be to save the Dissenters souls. If they would remove what is in their own judgment but little, and what may be done without their sin, but what cannot be complied with by the Dissenter without his great sin, the Controversie is ended, the *Schism* lost, and the Dissenter restor'd to the *Catholick Church*, and may be sav'd. Let the World judg then who is in the fault.

There remaineth nothing more that is worthy our consideration, unless the many *slips* of our Author may be esteem'd as such,

such, by the Authors insisting on my paralleling Dr. *Stillingfleet* and *Bellarmino*, not only in their *Dividing Principles*, but also in that, even when by their Impositions; they make the greatest rents in the *Church* imaginable, they *speak well of Union*, but this is only an overt-act of his inadvertency. For the reason why I mentioned this, was to obviate a common Objection, viz. *How can you parallel the Doctor and Bellarmine in this, seeing the Doctor cries up Union so much, as the designe of his great Book, as well as of his Sermon?* To which I reply, That though the *Principles of Bellarmine* were Dividing, yet he cries up Union; for which reason though the Doctor applauds *Union*, yet in doing so, doth no more than *Bellarmino*, and therefore may be as much a Divider as *Bellarmino*, notwithstanding those many plausible Discourses concerning the excellency of Union; for Union is a lovely name in the judgment of such as will do nothing to obtain the thing.

His passing over the most momentous parts of the *Enquiry*, without saying any thing considerable unto 'em, makes a further Defence, at present, unnecessary; I say for the present, because he seems to threaten, as if I should hear more of it in *DUE TIME*.

To close then this discourse, it only remains, that in Charity to our Author, whose *Affections to Dr. Stillingfleet* have so abundantly blinded his Judgment, that he cannot, though in searching till he hath wearied himself, find out any Mistake in the Dr's Preface, I'll give him an *Account* of a few among many; and then shew what little Reason such of the *Church of England*, who are for the *Grotian*, or Bishop *Laud's* Model, have to reproach Dissenters, as a People carrying on *Popish Designs*, in blasting the honour of the first Reformation.

§ 1. *An Account of some of those Mistakes, which are found in Dr. Stillingfleet's Preface to his Unreasonableness of Separation, not to mention any thing of the Parallel between the Dean and the Jesuit, so much insisted on in the Enquiry.*

1. **T**HE Dean asserted, p. 14. a *suitableness* between the *Dissenters Pretences*, and the *Jesuits Doctrine*, about Spiritual Prayer: whereas I have evinced the contrary.

2. That the Grounds and Reasons of the first Separation of the old Nonconformist from the *Church of England*, are said to be the *Jesuits* crying down all *Forms of Prayer*, and setting up *Spiritual Prayer* in the room thereof. But I have proved, that the first who separated, did keep to a Form of Prayer.

3. That the Dissenters do blast the honour of the first Reformation; but they so far countenance it, as to endeavour the carrying it on.

4. That the Dissenters are the best *Proctors* the *Papists* could meet with, their *fittest* and *aptest Instruments*; that they were made the *Engins* of the *Roman Conclave*, p. 16. All which the Doctor takes out of Archbishop *Whitgift*. But an unjust Censure, if not a great Mistake.

5. That the *Episcopacy* now and in King *Edward's* days was the same; whereas in King *Edward's* days they held all their Courts in the King's name, but now in their own.

6. That there is no considerable difference between the Reformation begun in *Edward* the 6th, and that carried on in Queen *Elizabeth's* time: Whereas 'tis most apparent, that in King *Edward's* time they judged the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*; but in Queen *Elizabeth's* not a word of it; and many other differences.

All which relate unto *matter of fact*, and therefore may be rightly called *Historical Mistakes*. Many more might be insisted on, but these are sufficient to help our Author to see, that if his eyes had been good, he needed not to weary himself in making a search after them without effect. If this will not satisfy our Author, if he will call for a larger list of the *Dean's* Mistakes, I do

do assure him 'tis easie enough to add a multitude more, although I delight not in a detecting the Weaknesses of any.

§ 2. Thus having given an hint of some of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Mistakes found in his Preface; I shall conclude, by shewing what little Reason, such as our Author, have to make such a prodigious noise about the Dissenters subserviency to *Papish Designs*, in blasting the honour of the Reformation.

Sir, If the case be narrowly searched into, you will find, that in all times since the first Reformation, those call'd *Puritans* were a block in the way to the *Church of Englands* passing over towards *Rome*. Had it not been for the Industry of the *Nonconformist*, as all the forreign Protestant *Churches* beyond the Seas are *Unchurched* by our high-flown Episcopal men, even so they should have been abandon'd as *Heretical*, but that the *Dissenter* makes such a clamour on all occasions about *Popery*.

You have very ingeniously distinguish'd between the *Church*, and the *Court of Rome*, and have taken the most effectual care to endeavour that favour might be shewn the *Church of Rome*, even when you cry down *Popery*; as if the common People had understood by *Popery* no more than your self, namely the *Court of Rome*; whereas they think, that when you cry down *Popery*, you are enemies to the *Church of Rome*. A pretty juggle! *Popery* is an odious thing, even when to be a *Roman Catholick* is worthy of all applause. *Laud* was no *Papist*, he was an enemy to *Popery*, when a cordial Friend to the *Church of Rome*. *Popery* is detestable, when all the care imaginable must be taken, that nothing be done to the disgust of the *Roman Church*. Consult *Bramhall* and *Heylin*, to mention no more, to see whether these be not their Sentiments.

You boast strangely of King *Edwards* Reformation, not considering how short of it, in some things, you are fall'n. You represent us as blasters of the Reformation begun in his days, not duely minding what one of your own Faction, Dr. *Heylin*, hath said on't in his *Preface to the History of the Reformation*:

Take the Character he gives of *Edward the 6th*, and make the most of it; 'tis this, *Scarce had they (saith he) brought it, [viz. the Reformation] to pass, when Edward died, whose death, I cannot reckon for an Infelicity to the Church of England. For being ill-principled in himself, and easily inclin'd to embrace such Counsels as were offered to him, it is not to be thought but that the rest of the Bishopricks (before sufficiently impoverished) must have followed Durham, and the poor Church be left as destitute of Lands and Ornaments, as when she came into the world in her natural Nakedness.*

From these words of *Heylin* 'tis evident, That such as are of this *Grotian* Faction, do reflect sufficiently on the Reformation then begun, and also plainly enough suggest, That if *K. Edward* had lived longer, the Reformation had gone on further than you or your party desire; it may be they would have gone on so far as those you now call *Schismaticks*. If so, how comes it to pass that the Dissenters by acting so agreeably to what *King Edwards* Protestants would have done, cast any reproach on that so happily begun Reformation?

In fine, It cannot but amuse wise men, to observe how prudently *Dr. Stillingfleet* and his Substitute insist on the Dissenters subserviency to the *Papish* Interest: Whereas 'tis most manifest, that the *Papists* themselves do with the greatest confidence conclude none more opposite, nor more injurious to their Designs than the Dissenter. However, seeing one Dissenter spake but a word for the forbearance of a meer conscientious Papist, this is enough to animate those Gentlemen to load the whole Party with the reproach of being great friends to Popery. The which is the more remarkable, because all this cry is even when a Son of the Church, yea a Reverend Divine of that name hath written a Volume in favour of the Church (though not of the Court) of *Rome*, without any notice taken of it. And the Dean himself in that very Preface in which he so much declaims against the Dissenter, doth speak much more in favour of the *Papists*, than any Dissenter ever did; for he himself asserts, *That it will be thought great hardship when mens heats are over, for them only (viz. the*

the Papists) to be deprived of the liberty of their Consciences, when the wildest Fanaticks are allow'd it. p. 79.

Moreover, what is matter of greater surprize is, That all this stir is rais'd from one word out of a Dissenters mouth, even when great things have been done by some who pretend to be sons of the Church; in favour of the Papist, to the turning the edg of those Laws that were made against *Papists* on Protestant Dissenters, without any remark, as if it had been highly meritorious in a Church-man to act for all *Papists* in the general, tho' an unpardonable crime in a Dissenter to speak but one word for the supposed conscientious only.

That some of the Church of *England* have acted in favour of all sorts of *Papists*, to the advancing *Popery*, is notorious, as hath been observed by Sir Francis Winnington at the Trial of the Lord Stafford. Another encouragement, my Lord (saith Sir Fr. W.) which the *Papists* had, was, That by the means of those Ministers who were secretly of their Faction, whenever his Majesty was pleased to command the Laws made against them in the Reign of *Q. Elizabeth* and *K. James*, to be put in due execution, his good intentions were frustrated, and the severity of those Laws was turn'd upon the Protestant Dissenters. This was a Master-piece of Rome, not only to divert from themselves the edg of those Laws which were design'd against them; but to turn them upon the Protestants, and to make them useful to advance the Romish Interest.

The same is also the sense of the Commons assembled in Parliament, as is to be seen in their Address unto his Majesty, November 29. 1680. where they declare unto his Majesty in these words, *At home, if your Majesty did at any time by the advice of your Privy Council, or of your Two Houses of Parliament, command the Laws to be put in execution against Papists, even from thence they gain'd advantage to their Party, while the edg of those Laws was turned against Protestant Dissenters, and the Papists escap'd in a manner untouch'd.*

Thus many a Son of the Church have heretofore taken an especial

especial care to turn the edg of Laws against *Papery*, on the *Dissenter*. But this is not speaking for a forbearance ; 'tis but an actual affording forbearance to 'em all in general. Of which one word must not be spoke. As if such men as our Author would that all the Respects which are had for *Papists*, must be confin'd to them, who alone without offence may shew it 'em.

But 'tis pretty evident, that there are other *Conformists* of another mind, as may appear by the *Countray-Conformists* further *Reply* to this *Defence*, or *Vindication*, which we have received from him in these Sheets following, and to which I refer my Reader.

FINIS.

Mr.

Mr. PARKHURST,

HAVING information that you are Printing some Papers of others in Answer to the Defence of Dr. *Stillington*, I have thought fit upon advice to send you these three or four sheets to put in, as one concern'd among the rest.

The young *Hero* that hath written this Defence, hath treated his Antagonists with no less a supercilious contempt than the Dr. ; but he hath not written his Book with the like judgment and sense. I cannot say that he hath in any thing confuted them; but he doth grossly pervert their words, and give them a meaning which is contrary to their intention, and then drolls upon it, and mightily pleases himself in his Victory and Success. And this he hath done almost throughout his Book.

He that reads the Book, and doth not compare it with the Authors whom he pretends to Answer, may perhaps think there is something in it : But if he shall diligently do this, he will alter his opinion. I will instance in one particular : Mr. *Maxter*, among other things, objects the renunciation of the Covenant for our *selves* and *others*, when *we know not their sense*. These last words he interprets of the *Takers* of that Covenant, when Mr. B. meant it of the *Imposers* ; and no wonder then if he makes fine work of it.

The Author of the *Reflections* hath reason to take notice of these his dealings in this kind ; and I do foresee how he is like to fare again ; yet being one for whom I have so near a concern, I cannot refuse a sheet or two (having this intimation) in his behalf, especially seeing he is a Son of the Church ; and 'tis convenient his Brethren should rightly understand him.

It is in the Preface I am engaged ; and (p. 3.) thus he begins.

gins. *The Countrey Conformist* in his *Reflections* on Dr. Stillingfleet, endeavours to excuse Mr. B. from intending the D. of St. Pauls, in that lewd character that he gave, of a most unskilful, proud, partial, obstinate, impertinent Adversary, by making it the description of such Substitutes as had neither the Candor nor Learning of the Doctor.

He did so; and how doth this Gentleman prove that he endeavoured it to no purpose? Why even thus: *However any impartial Reader will see cause to believe, that Mr. B. had the Dean in his eye, tho' he had not courage enough to apply every thing to him, but left his Readers to apply as much as they pleased.*

To which I reply, There's no Impartial Reader can believe that Mr. B. intended the Dr. in that lewd Character, as he is pleased to call it; and it is a rare faculty this Author hath of misrepresenting the words of other men, and to put his sense upon them as he lists, and then brazen it out. I will add withal, that it seems a little strange that Mr. B. that hath courage enough to libel Church and State, as this Author often says, and to cast dirt upon the Church and Church-men, as 'tis in his next page, should be afraid to apply to the Dr. any part of that Character which he thought did belong to him.

The Gentleman proceeds in the same page, *But suppose he means this of such Substitutes as had neither the Candor nor Learning of the Dr. I reckon a man may fall many degrees short of the Dr. and yet not deserve such a character, or be unworthy of Mr. B's notice.*

Sir, the question is not, Whether a person may not fall many degrees short of the Dr. and yet not deserve that Character; but whether a person may not fall so far beneath him, as to deserve it, and yet officiously substitute himself in the place of the Learned Doctor; and whether such an one may not be unworthy of Mr. B's notice?

Our Author adds, p. 4. *As for the former (i. e. Candour) I confess a very great proportion of that is necessary for any man, that will treat Mr. B. with any tolerable Civility, when in all his late Writings he casts so much dirt upon the Church and Churchmen: And this Author will not allow the Dean himself any great share of that, though he has very sparingly, considering the frequent provocations,*

ocations, and very decently and modestly, considering the occasions he takes for it, rebuked that *buffing Disputant*.

To this I answer, That Mr. B. hath reprov'd the faults of Churchmen in words pretty plain and sharp, I do easily acknowledge, (and so have some regular Sons of the Church done also; See *Englands faithful Reprover and Monitor*; and a Book called *Ichabod*.) But that he hath thrown dirt upon them, (unless speaking truth be casting dirt) I shall not easily grant; and I am of opinion, if this Author and some others had lived in the days of the old Prophets, yea and of the Son of God himself, and had heard their Sermons and Discourses, they would have said, That they Defamed the Governors of the Church, and Libelled the State.

That a great deal of candour is necessary for those that will treat such as reprove them with Civility, I do easily concede, yea and a great deal of Humility, Self-denial, Tenderness of Conscience, and the fear of God too; But all this is no more than their Duty, and if they had any considerable measure or degree of these Virtues, they would find no great difficulty in treating such as reprove them with Respect and Kindness.

As to what concerns the Learned Doctor, I have always esteemed him, and do to this day, a person of Candour; but good men are sometimes transported, and do such things as are inconsistent with the habitual Temper and Constitution of their own Minds: And I hope the excellent Dr. suffered some such kind of Transport, when he replied to Mr. B. in his late Book.

That the Dr. did very sparingly, decently and modestly rebuke Mr. B. which this Author calls a *buffing Disputant*; I shall grant also, if the Doctor's rebukes be compared with this Authors. For he hath observed no Laws of Modesty, Decency or Decorum therein, but after a most profuse and scornful manner hath reproached and despised him, to his own greater Infamy and Reproach. For Mr. B's Reputation for Learning and Judgment is too firmly established in the minds of Impartial and Unbiased men, that all that he can say to abate it, will be but throwing water on a rock, that will return and dash himself.

In the same page he adds, *As for the latter, (i. e. Learning) I acknowledg my self such a Substitute, as may not compare with the Doctor.*

This I think (bating the Texts of Scripture which he quotes) is one of the truest passages in all his Book; and I have a Veneration for truth, and will not speak any thing to the disadvantage of it; but let the Author have the honour of having spoke it once at least In a Book of six or seven hundred Pages.

Page the 5th he says, ' I shall begin with the Reflector, who writes himself a Conformist Minister in the Country; and this is the only thing considerable in it, that it is the testimony of one of our own Church against the Dean of *St. Pauls*, and for his adversaries: And for that reason Mr. B. at the end of his Answers refers his Readers to him, that those may receive that from a Conformist, which he will not receive from such an one as he.

And then he addes; ' But what is this to the purpose? If there be some such Conformists among us now, as there were in 1643, who raised a Church-War, and then pulled down Church and State, to set up a Presbyterian Party? and such a Conformist our Reflector is, who vindicates Mr. B's Parochial Episcopacy, which is but a new name for Presbytery, as I have proved in the following Treatise.

To which I answer, I had thought our Author had begun with the Reflector some time since; but peradventure what he hath hitherto said, hath been only like the slight velitations of the Avant-guards of an Army; he intends now to fall to down-right blows: Be it so, 'tis to be hoped the Reflector may sur vive his most powerful Impressions, and the rudest of his Assaults: For though he talks like one of the Sons of *Anak*, for ought that I can see, he performs as little, and something less than other men, that do only but talk.

But to proceed to the matter; I will assure him, that the Countrey-Conformist gives no testimony against the Dean of *St. Pauls*, or for his Adversaries, but out of the Love and Zeal that he hath for Peace. The Church of God in this Nation is broken into pieces, *Ephraim* is against *Manasseh*, and *Manasseh* against *Ephraim*; and this I dare say is indeed matter of sad Meditation (for I know him very well) to the Countrey-Conformist, who hath no other Controversie with the Reverend and Learned Doctor, than on the behalf of Peace.

As to what our Author says concerning those Conformists that raised a War in 1643. and pulled down Church and State

to set up a *Presbyterian* parity, the *Country Conformist* hath nothing to say, unless it be to assure him, That as he had nothing to do in that, so he never intends to have any thing to do in another. He is no admirer of that which this Gentleman calls a *Presbyterian Parity*; he very well likes of *Diocesan Episcopacy*, provided their Diocesses be no bigger than they were in the first two hundred years, yea, than they were in the third and fourth Centuries, in most parts of the Christian world. Let us have but such Churches and such Bishops, with *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, as were in the Churches of *Corinth*, *Jerusalem*, and *Antioch*, in the days of *Clemens*, *James*, and *Ignatius*, and the *Country Conformist* is satisfied, and so would Mr. B. and most *Nonconformists* in *England* besides. Whether this kind of *Episcopacy* be a new name for *Presbytery*, and whether this Author have proved it, I leave to such *Readers* to judg, as can consider as well as read his Book.

But how comes this Gentleman to know that the *Country Conformist* is such a one as those that raised a Civil War some years ago, and pulled down Church and State to set up a *Presbytery*? Can a man oppose nothing that is defended by some Church-men, but he must immediately be reported a secret Traytor or Rebel? Is this becoming Christianity, or the Preachers of it? Do these men believe the Gospel, that dare slander and traduce their brethren in such a villanous manner? 'Tis a word I received from him, I hope he will take it agen. Tho' it should be granted the Miter supports the Crown; yet surely the Errors and Vices of Church-men give no support unto it; and I am of opinion, that a man may speak for peace, and against the opinions and corruption of Churches and Church-men, and yet be a very good subject to his Prince, notwithstanding that perpetual buz of Rebellion that is suggested by some Huffs in the prejudice of such men and their discourses.

But why did I enquire how this *Monsieur* came to know that the *Country Conformist* was such another as those that raised the Rebellion in forty three? The nature of the assertion betrays the Author of the Information, and there needs no great skill in Magick to find him; yet lest he should be ignorant of him, I will be so kind as to tell his name, he is called *Beelzebub* the Father of lyes; and I hope when he writes agen, he will be-

were of him, and hold better correspondencies for his information.

Pag. 7. he adds : *Our Conformist doth plainly deride the Dean for thinking he can justify our present Episcopacy* ; and then quotes his words as followeth : *But the Dr. makes no question but he shall confute this fanciful man, and make it appear, that our present Episcopacy (which Mr. B. opposes.) is agreeable to the institution of Christ; and the best and most flourishing Churches.* And easily he may, if Mr. B. be such a pitiful Antagonist.

But what is there in these words that favour of derision ? I have read and considered them agen and agen, and I cannot find it by all the search that I can make. The Learned Dr. had pitied Mr. B. and given sufficient evidence of the mean opinion he had of his performances in his late Books, and particularly in his *Treatise of Episcopacy* ; and is it to deride the Dean to say, he may easily confute so contemptible an Adversary ? This I confess I cannot understand.

And yet after all I am not satisfied, that the Learned Dr. or his Defender hath confuted what Mr. B. hath said in prejudice to our present Diocesan Episcopacy ; he says that the enlargement of Diocesses hath varied the species of Episcopacy ; and gives many arguments for the proof of it, which neither the Dr. nor this Gentleman hath attempted to answer.

I know the latter of them says, that the enlargement of Diocesses doth not vary the species of Bishops ; and that a great and a little King are specifically the same Governours : But I can by no means believe this to be true of Bishops, whatever it be of Kings : For the Diocess of the Pope is only bigger than that of the Bishop of London, or Worcester, or Lincoln ; and yet I think they are Governours specifically distinct, and I hope this Gentleman thinks so too. Yea, give me leave to suppose that there were but two Bishops in England, there would be only a gradual difference in their Diocess, and yet I suspect some men would think that the Government were specifically altered ; but let not our Author infer that this supposition is my desire (for he is apt to pervert mens words), for I will assure him, that I do not desire it, but would have many more Bishops, not less.

In fine, 'tis my opinion, that the needs of the Church, and the abilities of Bishops to perform the work of the Episcopal Office, ought

ought to determine the extent of their Dioceses. Let their Diocesses be as big as they can manage and no bigger, and if so, I am sure they must be reduced to smaller limits than now they are. No Bishop can discharge the proper work of his Office in a thousand, or five hundred Parishes; nay, I will say, That there are many single Parishes in England that will employ the most industrious Bishops on earth.

If it be said, that they do perform the proper work of their Office in many Parishes, I utterly deny it, that the work is not done, and thence proceeds the prophaness and wickedness of particular Churches; and thence follows the Schisms, and Separations that have and do vex this Church at this day.

Page. 1b. Our Author proceeds: *He pleads* (i. e. the Countrey Conformist) *for taking off the Impositions* (in general without any limitation) to receive the Presbyterians again into our Church, which before he told us, *were Subscriptions, Declarations, &c.* and *some few Alterations besides: That is,* faith our Commentator, *either a form of Prayer, or at least our present Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Administration of religious Offices: Now he is an admirable Conformist indeed, who at once grants away the Episcopal Office, and instead of it, setteth up a Bishop in every Parish; or either an Anti-Christian Bishop of Bishops, or an Ecclesiastical Minister of State to head and govern them, and alters the whole frame of our Worship; and into the bargain leaves every man to do as he saith, and all this without injuring our present Constitution: Nay he concludes, That all those that hinder the Union of Presbyterians with this Church, by continuing the Impositions, are Factors for the Pope.*

In this Paragraph are a great many falsehoods. He charges the Countrey Conformist with pleading for the Admission of the Presbyterians into the Church, without any Impositions, Subscriptions, or Declarations. This was very ill done of him, if it be true, which I do a little suspect, because this Gentleman is so apt to misunderstand, and misrepresent the words and meaning of his Adversaries. The Countrey Conformist hath declared in several places of his Books, That he pleads the Cause of none but tolerable Dissenters; and for the Admission of none into the Church, but such as can Officiate in our Parochial Assemblies; but how this difference can be made without Impositions, or Subscriptions, is not imaginable: And therefore to say no more,

I think this Author hath injur'd and wronged him, in this report of his judgment.

And whereas by those few *Alterations besides*, that the Country-Conformist speaks of, he understands either a Form of Prayer, or the present Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Administration of Religious Offices, 'tis his own Comment, and he is not obliged to confute it. Yet thus much I will say on his behalf, that upon my knowledge, he is in his judgment for a Form of Prayer in Publique-Offices, and Administrations, and hath a very hearty esteem for that of our *Church*; but I cannot say so of the Ceremonies; I think he might be easily perswaded to part with them; and if some exceptionable passages in the Liturgy and Rubricks were altered, I believe he would make no opposition to it.

But he charges this *admirable Conformist* (as he is pleased to call him) with giving away at once the Episcopal Office, and instead of it sets up a Bishop in every Parish, and either an Antichristian Bishop of Bishops, or an Ecclesiastical Minister of State to govern them. How little there is of truth in this charge, may be collected from what I have said already. The Conformist sets up no more Bishops than the necessities of the *Church* and the duty and work of the Episcopal-Office requires; and I understand not that this is giving away the Episcopal Office: And if this Author can free Metropolitan Bishops from Antichristianism; which he says *some do derive from the very days of the Apostles, and that not without some good appearance of Reason*, I hope the Conformist will defend the *Episcopi Episcoporum* from that appellation.

As to what he says of an Ecclesiastical Minister of State, the Conformist hath no more to reply than this; He hopes this Gentleman will not plead an Exemption for the Clergy from under the Civil Magistrates Power and Government; and if this be granted, I know not what can be matter of Controversie between him and this Author: For he supposes him to exercise no Power over the Bishops, but what is inherent in the King, and in this Minister of State by Delegation; that is in few words, to see that they do their own Duty carefully, reprove their Negligence and Male-administrations, and preserve peace among them. And what is there in this Doctrine that our
Author

Author should take such offence at, I am yet to seek.

He adds, *And alters the whole frame of our Worship, leaves every man to do as he lists, and all this without injury to our present Constitution.* In these Lines, to speak plainly, there is not one word of truth, as any man may easily collect from what I have said already: And this Gentleman himself confesses in the next page, *That the Conformist will not indeed allow of universal Toleration.* How this can be reconciled with *Leaving all men to do as they list*, I am not able to tell.

That the Conformist said, That those that hinder the Union of Presbyterians with the Church of England, by continuing the Impositions, are Factors for the Pope, I do easily acknowledg, and I believe he is still of the same minde; and as I remember he gave some Reasons for it too, which this Gentleman takes, no notice of. When he confutes them, perhaps he may hear of a Vindication, if there be just reason for it.

Page the 8th he proceeds thus; *He (i. e. the Conform.) pleads for the Indulgence of others, particularly the Independents, who, he says, will be content with their own Congregations, and is mightily taken with Mr. Humfreys Project, That the tolerated Churches (such as Independents) be declared parts of the National Church, whereof the King to be the Head.*

The Country-Conformist is so great a Lover of Peace, that I do easily suppose he might be pleased with Mr. H's Project, as he calls it; and I do assure him, that I myself am much more pleased with it, since I read his Book, than I was before, though I had always a value for it: For I think the Design of uniting the Dissenting Protestants in this Nation, is into one National Church, whereof the King to be the Head, more laudable than the design of uniting Protestants in a General Council, or in a Pope, Primate, or Metropolitan, which seems to be the design of our Author, though he hath not Courage, or Instruction enough as yet to speak it out.

For he affirms, 1. *That the Episcopal Office and Power is but one, and not resident in the Bishops of the Universal Church, p. 212.* 2. *That the Independency of Bishops is inconsistent with Ecclesiastical Unity, p. 115.* And 3. *that although equals have no Authority over one the others, yet a Colleague hath Authority over any one of his Colleagues, p. 213.* 4. *That the Bonds and Combinations of Churches*

are

are of Divine Right, though the ordering and determination of them be of Humane Prudence; p. 258. 5. That the Unity of the Church is as much of Divine Right, as any Form of Government in it; and that the whole Church may be divided into greater or lesser parts, as may best serve the ends of Peace and Unity. And that it seems strange to him, that a National or Patriarchal Church should not be thought as much a Divine Institution, as any particular Church, p. 259. And further he adds, When Christ and his Apostles have instituted one Form of Government for all particular Churches, and commanded them all to live in Unity, Peace, Communion, and amicable Correspondency with each other, the Union and Combination of Churches into one, according to this Institution, to serve the ends of Catholick Communion, must be thought as much a Divine Institution, as the bounds of particular Churches. For if we will not allow those Churches to be of Divine Institution, which have Officers of Divine Appointment, and are formed according to the general Directions of Christ and his Apostles, so as may serve the ends of Church-Government, I know not where to find a Church of Divine Institution in the world, pag. 259, 260.

These are the words of our Author; from whence we may collect many things for our Information.

1. That the Bishops of the Catholique Church are the regent part thereof, in the same sense that the Bishops of any National Church are the regent part of that Church: For although there be no Superiority among Bishops, their Power and Office being the same; yet Independency among them being inconsistent with Ecclesiastical Unity, both in the National and in the Universal Church, they are bound to unite for the Government of both, and this by Divine Command, Authority and Obligation. 2. That whatsoever is determined by the Bishops of the Catholick Church, doth oblige all particular Bishops and all Christians all the world over; provided they determine nothing contrary to the Word of God. 3. That whatever Bishop shall refuse their Canons and Determinations, and govern his particular Church by other Laws than they shall appoint, is a Schismatick, and they may Depose and Excommunicate him; yea, if a whole combination of Bishops do refuse to govern their National Church by their Laws, Appointments and Constitutions, they are all Schismaticks; and if the Nation refuse to forsake such Bishops, they

they are all Schismatics also, both they and their Bishops are liable to the same Censure. 4. That the external Union of the Catholick Church consists in their Union to and with the Bishops thereof; that is, with a General Council. See pag. 595. where he makes *Catholick Communion* to consist in two things; 1. In the Agreement and Concord of the Bishops of the Catholick Church among themselves. 2. In the Communion of particular Churches and Christians with each other. And he adds, That Catholick Communion is no arbitrary thing, but essential to the Church; and whoever violates it by an unreasonable Dissent, he is a Schismatick whoever he be, and no Member of the Catholick Church, pag. 601. 5. That Metropolitane & Patriarchal Churches are of Divine Appointment, as much as any other Churches, & must govern their Churches by such Laws as are advised by a General Council, or by the Bishops of the Church Universal; For although they be not founded on any express Divine Law, yet they are warranted by our obligations to Catholick Unity, p. 293. And for my part, I am not able to see any reason, why the same obligations to Unity may not warrant one Papal Church, as well as three or four Patriarchal Churches in all the Christian world. For the Papists think it the most effectual way to preserve Unity, and for ought that I know they may think as wisely as this Gentleman. I envy neither him nor them the pleasure of their Dreams; but I hope there are but few Church-of-England-men that do think the same thoughts with him: these were the thoughts of *Hugo Grotius*, whom Bishop Brambal commends and defends: *Unitas antistitis optimum est adversus Schisma remedium, quod & Christus monstravit, & Experiencia comprobavit.* Vid. Annot. in consultat. de Religione, ad Art. Sept.

I have quoted the words of this Author, and I am not conscious to my self that I have perverted them, or made any ill deductions from them; and if it be his design to unite all Protestants in the Decrees of General Councils, and in the Intervals of Councils in the Pope, or three or four Patriarchs, who are to govern according to their Canons; I do assure him, that I prefer Mr. *Humfry's* design far before it: For I am of opinion, 'tis a more Christian Design to unite Protestants together and among themselves, than to unite them with the Papists. Mr. *Humfry's* Design I will transcribe from his Book, that those

that shall read these few Sheets, may compare it with that of our Author.

Archbishop *Usher* hath left us his Model for an Accommodation: And it hath been upon the hearts generally of all moderate persons, that a reduction of such a Government into our Church, as was in the Primitive Times, (when there was a *Confessus Presbyterorum* joyn'd with the Bishop in all his Acts of Ordination and Jurisdiction) were the way, and only effectual way to our true Happiness and Reformation. Unto which, if one thing more might be added, that is, If the Common-Prayer might be new cast (it being fit that such a vessel for the Sanctuary should be all of pure Gold) so as the whole of it were composed of Scripture-Phrase altogether, leaving nothing at all liable any more to exception, unless the Imposition of a Form only, (which I doubt not but is also justifiable by Scripture Instances, as well as sound Reason) it might go near to put an end to all Dissension among the Sober and Peaceable of the Nation.

It is this I know is apt to recur into the Imaginations of good men; and forasmuch as there was lately two Bills prepared for *Comprehension* (or Uniting the *Poetstants*), and for *Indulgence* (or repealing the Penal Statutes); I shall not, I hope, incur any blame, if I apprehend that such men who are most considerate and intent upon the Interest of God, in what they seek, do, or did look upon either of such Bills, as no other than an *English Interim*, preparative to this higher Concord and Union of the Bishop with his Presbyters, according to the Primitive Pattern mentioned, as soon as more mellow Opportunity, and well-adviced Piety, should administer unto such farther Perfection.

Nevertheless, in regard there is no Uniting of a Nation can be supposed by any Model, but such as is of Human Contrivance; and there are multitudes of Holy and Learned Men in this Kingdom, that do believe the way of their Gathered Congregations is after a higher Pattern than this of Primitive Episcopacy it self; if there were any hope of the return of it; it is manifest that there is no Society, which is National in England, could be formed on these terms; because these Congregational-men can never recede from that which is of Divine Appointment.

'ment, for the sake of any *Antiquity* whatsoever. They do hold
'Particular Churches to be of *Christ's* Institution, and *Diocesan* of
'*Ecclesiastical* Consent only; and under the Notion of *Divine*
'*Right*, it is Sin to them to submit to any *Bishop*.

'There is another Notion then that must be advanced to take
'in these good Men of *This Way*, as well as those of the *Paro-*
'*chial* and *Diocesan Way*, into one Political Body, for the making
'up the *National Church* of *England*, whereof the *King* is Head,
'as I have been speaking; and that is, by an Act of Parliament
'*Legitimizing* these *Meetings* of the *Nonconformists*, so as to be-
'come thereby immediately *Parts* of the *Church*, as *National*, no
'less than *Parochial* Assemblies. It was a good thing in the
'*House of Commons*, that they were about to free many Innocent
'Men from the danger of the *Penal Statutes*; but the making
'such Meetings to be *Legal*, is a Design of another Nature, of
'a far greater, nobler, and vast Importance. See page 28, 29,
'30, 31. To which add what he says, pag. 36. 'If these *Sepa-*
'*rate Assemblies* were made *Legal*, the *Schism* presently, in re-
'ference to the *National Church*, were at an end. *Schism* is a
'*Separation* from that *Church*, whereof we ought, or are bound to
'be *Members*: If the *Supreme Authority* then loose our *Obligation* to
'the *Parish-Meeting*, so that we are bound no longer, the *Iniquity*
'upon that account is not to be found, and the *Schism* gone. It is
'one Act of Parliament would give a full Answer to all mens
'Arguments.

Mr. H's design may be easily gathered from these words,
which I have thus largely transcribed; and should our Superi-
ors favour and promote it, it would restore peace and quiet to
a Church and State almost broken to pieces by divisions, animos-
ities, fears and jealousies: By this means the sons of the Church
might enjoy their Dignities, Preferments and Livings, and be-
lieve their Government and Discipline to be of Divine right, and
exercise it on all that are of the same apprehension and judg-
ment: The Separate Congregations may enjoy their own opini-
ons concerning their own Government and Churches; and all
might live together in love, and every one sit under his vine and
fig-tree, and none make him afraid. A closer union I do easily
grant were desirable; but I am afraid this is all that is attaina-
ble in this Nation, yea and in the Christian world (whatever

our Author may say to the contrary); and that those that will have more, shall have less. 'Tis with Christian Churches as 'tis with some weakly constituted bodies, if no violent remedies be used, they may drill out for many years; but if you will be tampering, and nothing will satisfy you but a perfect health, you will soon destroy them.

If Churches that have some defects may be endured, God may have some worship, and we may see some peace among Christians; but if like Ecclesiastical Mountebanks we will be perpetually trying experiments upon sickly and diseased Churches, we may disturb the peace of Christians, destroy the Churches, and leave few to call upon the name of God in the world.

What I have discoursed, I think may with some probability be expected from Mr. H.'s design. But can we expect so much from the design of this Gentleman? Or is there the least shadow for it? For my part I can see no such thing; he must have better eyes, or worse, than I have, that can see any advantage like to betide Protestants by uniting in a General Council, or in a Patriarch or Pope, ruling by the Canons thereof. And yet I think this is that our Author would be at. For he affirms, *That it is not enough or sufficient to Christian Unity, that the Christians of one Nation, or one Congregation be united among themselves, unless they be united to the Catholique Church: For if there be but one Church, a whole Nation may be Schismatical, as well as single persons, &c.* Well then, I am past all doubt that Protestants will never agree to the Canons of a General Council, nor to the Government of a Patriarch or Pope according to those Canons, and then they are all Schismatics; and if the Princes in whose Dominions they live, can be prevailed withal to do it, they are to be Proscribed, Banished, sent to the Gallies and Mines, or be chastised at home by Axes and Halters: And I think this is a very pious and charitable Design, and becoming a Protestant Doctor, and Son of the Church of England!

But by the way, give me leave to add, that whereas this Gentleman hath undertaken to vindicate the Learned Dean of St. Pauls, from what Mr. Humphrey hath said against him, concerning the Constitutive Head of this National Church, I am sorely afraid that he has given up the Doctor's Cause, and left

it to shift for it self as well as it can, or rather asserted that of his Adversary. The Doctor had said, *That we deny any need of a Constitutive Regent part, or one Formal Ecclesiastical Head as essential to a National Church.* This Mr. H. confutes, and this Author affirms and defends, but grants a *pars imperans & subdita*, or a ruling and ruled part, p. 567. Church-Governours united, and governing by consent, says he, are the governing part, Christian people in obedience to the Laws of our Saviour, submitting to such Government, are the ruled part; and all this is true without a Constitutive Regent Head, pag. ibid.

This methinks looks strange! That the Bishops by consent (which consent they are obliged to by the Laws of Christ) should be the *pars imperans*, and yet not the Constitutive Regent Head, is in my opinion a Paradox: For I would fain learn, what it is that makes a Constitutive Regent Head to any Body; Is it not Right and Obligation to Rule? Doth not this make Kings and Princes Constitutive Heads of their Principalities and Kingdoms? And doth not this make Aristocracies and Democracies the essential Regent part of those Commonwealths over which they do preside? Have the Bishops of this Nation Right and Obligation to rule all the Christian People in it? This I think our Author will grant: And how he will deny them to be the Constitutive Head of the National Church, with any consistency of Reason, I do not yet understand.

This Gentleman indeed says, *That though a National Church be one body, yet 'tis not such a body as he (Mr. B.) describes, nor can be according to its Original Constitution, which differs from Secular Forms of Government, by that ancient Church-Canon of our Saviour, It shall not be so among you. And then adds, A National Church, as governed by consent, may be one body in an Ecclesiastical, though not in a Civil Political sense.*

That it cannot be a Body, consisting of Head and Members in a Political sense, according to Mr. B's. description, I do not find proved by that Church-Canon of our Saviour.

That the Ecclesiastical and Civil Forms of Government do differ, I readily grant; but are there no other Differences but such as are essential?

A Regent formal Head and Members, is of the essence of political bodies, and that is no body that is without them, whatever

ever this Gentleman says to the contrary. Many other defects are consistent with the being of Political bodies; but if they want a Head, they are no Body. The Church differs in many things from Civil Political bodies, and particularly in this, that it is not armed *with civil power and jurisdiction*, p. 566. by which I suppose this Author means Coercive power. But what then? Hath the Church no Constitutive Head, because it hath no Coercive power? or because it cannot imprison, fine, and destroy its members? Masters, and Parents, and Tutors, can't do these things, and yet most men think they are the Regent formal Heads of their Families, children and pupils. Well then, against that marvellous Oracle of our Author, *That a National Church governed by consent, may be a body in an Ecclesiastical, tho' not in a civil political sense*, (i. e. tho' it may be a Church, yet it cannot be a Commonwealth or Kingdom) I will advance this proposition, That a National Church is a body in a political sense, as well as in an Ecclesiastical, or else it is no body at all; and that according to his own doctrine. And if he will defend the Deans cause, he must write a book in his own confutation, which I think he ought to do in revenge on himself, that he hath hitherto betrayed it, as the Dr. has the Church of *England's*.

Our Author, I remember, somewhere calls Mr. *Humfrey* Mr. *Baxter's* Eccho, when yet Mr. *Humfrey's* Answer to the Drs. Book, came out before Mr. *Baxter's*. When the Eccho now can be proved to go before the Voice, or the Voice to follow the Eccho, then shall the Deans determination of the question between him and them concerning the Constitutive Head of the National Church, be held as *unanswerable* as this Gentleman affirms it in one place, and as *admirable* as he cries it up in another.

Having said thus much on the behalf of Mr. *H.* I shall add a few lines more before I return to the vindication of the *Country Conformist*. The learned D. of *St. Pauls* had charged the Non-conformists with joining with the Papists for a general Toleration; and as a proof of what he affirmed, produces some few passages from a Book written, (tho' not printed) by Mr. *H.* in the year 1675. and reprinted with some alterations 1680. Mr. *Humfrey* gives the reasons of those alterations, but withal af-
firms

seems that he altered not his opinion. At which our Author makes some exceptions (pag. 26. of his Preface), and seems to suspect the truth of what Mr. H. had said concerning the alteration of some lines in his Book, without altering his judgment in that case. These are his words: *He will not own that he hath altered his judgment in the second Impression of his book, from what it was in the first: but people know not mens judgments but by their words; and the words of his first and second Edition contain a very different and contrary sense, which should suppose some alteration.*

What a spiteful malignant insinuation were this, if Mr. H. were not known to be one that does not lye! He persists upon the words *like toleration*, which after Mr. H. hath explained, is nothing but cavil, and I need no more than to repeat Mr. H's own words for the reproof of this Gentleman, who would not have omitted *these* when he cites *others*, if he had dealt honestly by him.

'The Dr. thinks or speaks as if the Author (in reprinting the Book) had changed his opinion; wherein I account he is most of all out, and most to blame. He who drew up the Book, is not one of that humour, as to turn with the times, but rather against them. The opinion he offered in the year --75. is the same that he holds now in the year --80. Here is an alteration indeed, as to more words, or some other words, but the same opinion, or solution, with the difference only of a further explication of it, and nothing therein (besides avoiding offence) intended. The Author had been wary in declaring the Toleration he proposed, to be a limited one, and provided against the Jesuit upon reason of State, and shewed his dread of Popery in dominion, but had omitted the distinction of a toleration, in regard to publick Assemblies, and the private exercise of a mans Religion. He explains himself therefore by way of supply, signifying that what he said at first, should be taken in regard to the tolerating the Papist only *privately*, as his meaning really was then, and is now but fuller expressed. This is the opinion he recedes not from (whether peculiar to himself, or not) *that no man should be persecuted meerly for his conscience, if there be no other reason.* Whether he be a Dissenter of one kind, or other, the common rule of Christianity must be remembered (he says) still, *that we do*

by.

** by all men as we would be done by, and that with what measure we mete to others, it shall be measured to us again.* These words are in all the Impressions.

And to this purpose I cannot but note what I find in Mr. B's. 2^d Def. p. 16. who after he hath spoken of Mr. H. upon this account, as a man of known *Latitude*, and *Universal Charity*, and *discountenancing Cruelty*, adds concerning himself; *And I so little fear the noise of the Censorious, that even now, while the Plot doth render them most odious, I freely say; 1. That I would have Papists used like men, and no worse than our own Defence requireth. 2. That I would have no man put to death for being a Priest. 3. I would not have them by any Law compelled to our Communion and Sacraments.* Nor can a man think but the Reverend Dean of St. Pauls himself had also some Compassion, Pity and Kindness for them, when he condemns such *Heats*, as transport men beyond the just bounds of *Prudence*, *Decency* and *Humanity* towards their greatest Enemies, Pref. pag. 34. And whereas this Gentleman objects, *That the alteration was not made in Mr. H's Book till five years after*, I hope there is a good reason for it, because it was so many years before the second Impression: and I know not by what means it could be altered till the Book was Printed a second time.

I return now to the *Countrey Conformist*. The Doctor had said in his Pref. pag. 78. upon the Principles of some of our Dissenting Brethren, *Let the Constitution be made never so easie to themselves, yet others may make use of their grounds, and carry on their differences as high as ever.* To which the Conformist had said, *There was no doubt but insufferable Hereticks might pretend Conscience and many other things for Indulgence, as well as modest and tolerable Dissenters; but that he thought there was no reason that they should have the same Concessions; and that he hoped our Governours would be able to distinguish between those that erre in small things, and those that subvert the Christian Religion.* This Answer doth not satisfie our Author, who enquires, (pag. 8.) *But in the mean time, how doth he answer the Deans Argument, that it is not the way to Peace, and Union, and to silence Differences?*

If I should reply to this Gentleman in other words, and give him another Answer; peradventure he may be unsatisfied, and ask

ask the same Question again: However I'll venture this once. Many of the Dissenters from the *Church of England* are found in their Judgments, and agree with us in all the great Essentials of the Christian Religion, and in most of the Integrals also; these would gladly incorporate with us, but that there are some Impositions that they cannot submit unto; now certainly if these things which are the reason and cause of the Difference between them and their Brethren were removed, the difference were at an end. Others there are that are men of sound Judgments in the main Articles of the Christian Religion, but cannot incorporate with us in the National *Church*; if these were Legally indulged, they would be free from fear, their minds would be at rest; amidst variety of Judgments and Practices, we might live together in Love and Peace. And thus I think I have told this Gentleman, how many of our differences may be ended, and how those that cannot be ended, may yet be laid to sleep, and persons made amicable and friendly. As for intolerable Hereticks, I shall not be their Patron, only I would have them used like men; and that nothing be done to them that is unworthy of the Christian Religion, which is made up in great part of Love, Kindness and Compassion: And if thus much Union and Peace will not satisfy this Author, I suppose he may look for it in Heaven, but I doubt that he will hardly find it in this world. I am of opinion, that a cessation of Differences among Christians and Churches, and a total cessation of sin, will appear at the same instant. I do sometimes admire, that those that never expect to see the one upon Earth, but are very calm and patient without it, should so passionately desire the other, that they can be content to move Heaven and Earth for the obtaining of it. What *Seneca* said of particular persons, I say of Churches, *Optimus est qui minimis urgetur vitio*; He is the best man that hath least faults, and there are none without them. Those are the best Churches which have the least of defects and imperfections; such as are without fault are not to be found out of Heaven. And as among men, the strong must bear the Infirmities of the weak; so among Churches, the strongest and most perfect must bear the Weakness and Infirmities of those that are more defective and imperfect. If our Author should say, that those that I plead for and call Churches, are no Churches, but a company of Schis-

matical Conventicles; I answer, I am of opinion, that they are as truly *Churches*, and parts of this National Church (or may be easily so made) as the *Churches* of *France*, *Holland*, *Geneva*, *Switzerland*, &c. are of the Universal: But if our Author shall please to cut them off from the Catholique (as I think according to his own Doctrine he must do) I shall permit him the liberty (for I know not how to hinder it) to cut off these from the National Church, having no mind at this time to debate the Justice of his Sentence. Only I will beg leave to tell him, that I can by no means believe, that what he doth on Earth will be ratified in Heaven; or that God will damn all that he gives up to the Devil.

If what hath been said doth not satisfie our Gentleman; give me leave to suppose him a Minister of the Reformed Church in *France*, be it at *Charenton*, *Caen*, *Saumur*, or where you please; and let me suppose that some Gentlemen of the Roman Catholick Religion address themselves to him after this manner: Sir, We pity your state and condition, and have a kindness for you, (for though you be an Heretick, you are one of human race) the King our Master will have but one Religion in his Kingdom; and you must comply with him, or else you are undone; your Estate, your Liberty, and peradventure your Life must all be sacrificed to him, for he is resolved, and peremptory in that resolution; all must serve God the same way, or they must bear the punishment of refusing it: Here are the Subscriptions that are made by the Catholick Clergy, do but set your hand to them; and you're safe, and may share with them in the Preferments of the Church.

To this our Author answers; Gentlemen, I bear an honour to our Puissant and Invincible Monarch, and am very ready to obey all his just commands; but in this particular I pray you have me excused; God is a King superiour to our Prince, and must be obeyed before him. I fear His Majesties Displeasure and Vengeance, but I am much more afraid of that of God; the one may hang or break me upon the wheel, but the other will damn me for evermore. I beseech you therefore interpose with his Majesty on the behalf of me and my Brethren, that we may have the same liberty of worshipping God, as for many years past we have enjoyed under him and his Royal Predecessors;

We

We vow all Duty and Allegiance to his Person and Government; we will defend them with our Lives and Fortunes; and we have nothing so dear to us (unless it be our Consciences) which we are not willing to sacrifice for his just Honour and Advantage. The Subscription you propose I cannot make, without the offence of God and my Conscience: And I must beg his Majesties Pardon, if I chuse to obey the God of Heaven, before his Vicegerent here on earth.

The Catholick Gentlemen replies, His Majesty is willing and resolved to put an end to all Differences and Controversies in Religion, he is weary of those eternal Squabbles that are managed by Divines of different persuasions. The Temple of Janus shall be shut, he will have no more Religious Wars among his Subjects. To grant you the Liberty of serving God after your own way, is not a method of ending Differences, but of perpetuating them: For when you are pleased, others may succeed to you, and under pretence of Conscience carry on Differences as high as ever.

Let our Author answer the Argument of these Catholick *Adversaries*, and I do humbly conceive I may be able from his own words to answer that of the Doctor, if it be not sufficiently done already: but let him not misunderstand or pervert my words. I do not affirm that the Impositions in the Church of England, and those of the Church of Rome are equally wicked, burdensome and offensive; all that I say is, they are both unlawful in the judgment of those that do refuse them: and the Arguments against relaxing those Impositions, or granting Liberty to those that do refuse them, are the same, and must receive the same Answers.

Page 9. The Conformist had said, That he hoped our Governours would distinguish between those that subvert the Christian Faith, and those that err in small things. Our Gentleman answers: *Thus our Governours have distinguished already, and yet it hath not put an end to our Controversies; nor is he (the Conformist) sure that once more distinguishing will do it.*

To which I reply, That when and where our Governours have made this distinction, I confess the Country Conformist is as ignorant as our Author will needs have him in the Constitution of our Church, p. 10. What particular persons may have done,

I do not enquire; but what the Governours of our Church have done. They have determined the conditions of Communion, and upon what terms the Clergy may minister at the Altar; but where by any publick act they have distinguished between the great essentials of the Christian Religion which must be believed, and lesler errors that may be tolerated, I do not know, and cannot find. If this Gentleman thinks that all things imposed as conditions of Communion either upon Laity or Clergy in England, are of the essence of Christianity, and that all who have other apprehensions concerning them, are damnable Hereticks, let him enjoy his Faith to himself, I am not like to become his profelyte, nor I think many others.

P. 10. Our Author proceeds; *Will not the excluded parties cry as loud for Liberty of Conscience; and complain of persecution, as they do now? Either these are good arguments, or they are not? If they be, they will hold good in all cases, that men must not suffer for their consciences, but be allowed the free exercise of their Religion according to their own persuasions. If they be not, let them leave off the pretences of scruples and tender consciences, with that liberty and freedom in exercising their Religion which they challenge as their natural birthright, and demand no more of that, than what the merit of their Cause requires.*

In this discourse there are more strange things than one. 1. He declares, that if those arguments that are brought for free exercise of Religion, from scruple and tenderness of Conscience, be good, they must be good in all cases. The meaning is this, One man doubts, whether it be lawful to use a Form of Prayer, another whether it be lawful to take the Sacrament kneeling, and the like. Now from these things therefore they plead for some condescensions. But no faith our Author, if we humor and indulge you in this scruple, we must do the like by such as doubt, whether Jesus Christ be the Saviour of the world: for if the argument from scruple of Conscience, be good in one case, 'tis good in all cases. 2. He supposes their arguments may not be good; and what must they do then? Why, they must leave off their pretences of scruple, and demand no more than the merit of their Cause requires. But what is this? Doth their Cause deserve some liberty and indulgence, tho' the reasons they plead for it, be nothing worth? This I confess looks to me unaccountable.

I have

I have been always apt to think, that the merits of a Cause were neither more nor less than the reasons that might be produced in favour of it. But cheer up *Nonconformists*, if you will but lay aside all claim to indulgence, and say, you have no reason to claim any, you may have it.

Page 1b. Our Gentleman proceeds. *As for what he (the Countrey Conformist) adds about the difference between subverting Religion, and some smaller errors, as a just foundation for liberty, or restraint: Suppose our Governors should think Schism as destructive to Religion, and the souls of men, as many heresies are, it would be an unreasonable thing to desire them to establish Schism by a Law; and yet if they did so, they would not be much mistaken in it.*

I answer: The *Countrey Conformist* did say, that the difference between subverting Religion, and some smaller errors, is a just foundation for liberty and restraint; and I know nothing this Author hath said in prejudice thereunto. Either all men of differing judgments and apprehensions must have liberty, or only some. If all, then is this Gentleman a greater Patron for liberty than I. If only some, then must they be distinguished by the opinions in which they differ, which is that Assertion the *Countrey Conformist* lays down.

If it be said, That no difference in opinions must be tolerated, then no man must be endured: for I much doubt whether there be any two men in the world that are in all things of the same mind; and so every man's hand will be against every man, and the Christian world will be a field of blood.

As to what our Author says in the next paragraph, (p. 11, 12.) of the *Countrey Conformist's* Ignorance and Enmity to the Church, Partiality to Dissenters, his charging the Dr. with haughtiness, and apologizing for the rude and barbarous treating of an excellent person without provocation, I reply. The *Countrey Conformist* upon my knowledge is not ignorant of the Constitution of our Church; nor is he any Enemy to any thing in it, but its imperfections, and the pertinacity of those Church-men that do in every thing defend it, and avow nothing in it needing Reformation. He hath no prejudice against the Dean, nor partiality for his Adversaries, any further than he conceives the D.'s Adversaries to have truth and right on their side, and him to be mistaken. That the D. hath treated the Dissenters severely in his Sermon,

mon, and his Adversaries with haughtiness and contempt in his Book, is not only the opinion of the *Countrey Conformist*, but the sorrow of many others who are no enemies to him. He hath made no Apology for any thing that is rude and barbarous in the Dr's Adversaries (for where that is, he doth not find) : He hath only endeavoured to put a true and candid interpretation upon what was otherwise liable to be misunderstood.

To the next paragraph (p. 13.) I shall need to say nothing, seeing the Gentleman does confess that the passage quoted by the *Countrey Conformist* out of the Dean's Sermon was sharp. And forasmuch as he is brought to this, I am not for that diverting entertainment he would give me, in the enquiry *what usage the Dr. hath met with* (from Mr. B. Mr. A. Mr. H.) upon *sa little provocation*, as he accounts. There is one passage only in reference to the *Countrey Conformist's* Apology for Mr. Baxter as to his way of writing, that I must not pass over. *If men* (says he) *revile and reproach without spite and anger, as much as other men can do with it; if a quick and earnest temper of mind, and keen and pungent stile, make a man guilty of as unjust censures and opprobrious reflections as the most inveterate spirit, what satisfaction is this to the injured person?*

To which I reply: How a man can revile and reproach without spite or anger, I confess I cannot tell. Our Saviour says, *Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh*; but how a man may speak plain English without either one or the other of these, and with no *inveterate spirit* at all, I can tell, and that is to speak out of love and zeal to peace, and for the vindication of the innocent and depressed. And thus I hope have I and Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Humfrey spoken, notwithstanding the six next pages which are spent in exposing some bare expressions of Mr. Humfrey (whom he hath also named, when he put not his name to his Book) without serving any end but the exposing them, upon my saying that Mr. H. had done Mr. Baxter and the Dr. both right, in praising the one, and rebuking the other. Mr. H.'s rebukes (says he) *I confess are plain, how modest let others judge by a perusal of some of them.*

Here he runs out six pages in citations. In answer to all which, I shall only make him this payment. *He hath cited, I will*

will recite Mr. H's expressions. He hath done nothing but cite them, to slur him : I shall need nothing but recite them for my own, and his full vindication.

The Doctor is one who may look on himself to have Abilities in some regard, which Mr. B. hath not : But if he should really value himself with Mr. B. upon the account of a profound Divine, he is a man who must want that Modesty in good earnest, whereof he makes a shew in the beginning of his Book, upon a comparison of his with Bishop Jewell. The Doctor hath his excellencies other ways, but he hath not Mr. B's. The Doctor's Soul is made of Free-stone, you shall have from him polished Learning. Mr. B's is made of Flint, you shall have from him acute Truth. Mr. B. (I will say) is one, like the man in the Neighbourhood who is first up, and all the Neighbours come for fire to his house; that is, a man indeed extraordinary. From whom the present Age do fetch Light, and unto whom the Ages to come will bring Honour. Above all, Mr. B. is a holy man, who will be for ever greater in his once refusing a Bishoprick, than the Doctor can be in getting one, if the present ill-managing this Cause doth not preclude his having any.

These are some of Mr H's expressions, and of Mr. B's Character, and which in my opinion, are weighed as well as written. I shall only add on mine own part those few words of the Apostle, *This witness is true.* And seeing I have quoted so much of that Learned man's words, in point of equal judging; I will not forbear the end of his Book, in point of upright dealing.

The Dr. had no need to lay out his parts upon such a Design as that he hath under his hands; nor hath he reason to despise or scorn, no nor to slight or neglect the meanest person. For I must confess, 'tis matter of real offence to me, that a person who is so learned a man, so honoured a man throughout the Nation, should prove a proud man, a disdainful person; which temper, if it be indulged, is so unendurable by God and man, that it will hurl any man into the dust. And I cannot do any better service in the earth to this otherwise very much worthy, and excellent Doctor, than to contribute the best I can to my utmost, for the bringing him to some ingenuous sense and Amendment of it. *Thou shalt not hate thy Brother in thy heart; but thou shalt*

* shalt in any wise rebuke him, and not suffer sin upon him. Answer
to Dr. Stillingfleet, so far as concerns the Peaceable Design.

I should now follow our Author to p. 20. where he returns to
the *Countray Conformist* (and there were some sheets done), but
because it is indeed but endless, and it will turn to no account,
but to ease my self, I desist.

*Existimat ejus Majestas (Rex Jacobus) nullam ad in eundam
Concordiam, breviorē fore viam, quam si diligenter separantur
necessaria a non necessariis, & ut de necessariis conveniat, omnis o-
pe infumatur: in non necessariis libertati Christiana locus detur.*
Ep. Caufaboni-ad Card Perroniam, p. 31.

Author of the Reflections, C. Conf.

THE END.

Mr.

Mr. Lob,

I cannot tell whether it be best to meddle with this Book, or let it alone. The wise man says *Answer* a man, and *Answer* not a man. There may be reasons to doe it, and reasons to forbear. Nevertheless if you determine upon it as to *your part*, I have fetcht the Book, and taken my pen and lookt it over as to *mine*. There is but one Chapter wherein I am concern'd, and I have no mind to meddle with any more, though when I am writing I may point at some few things besides.

Of all the Books that came out against Dr. *Stillingsfleet's*, there are those few sheets called *Additional Remarks* which are some of the *least* taken notice of, and of the *most* value. Not I count for the merits of the Controversie, which is not to be expected from a Conformist, but for the ingenuity of Spirit which he hath shewn in so singular exemplary a charity towards the Dissenter, and (what I count more peculiar) in such a true candid respect to the Doctor, even while he takes so natural a freedom as he does with him, that the *flouring* (for so is applause to the rising) of *this Authour*, is but alchimy to *his reprehension*. I am beholding I must confess to the Gentleman for my own part for his *Reflections*, but I must commend his *Additional Remarks*. I will commend them particularly to the Deans Defender, not for an *Answer*, but for his imitation. I do apprehend that in the writing his first sheets, he was not so well aware of their being Printed as he was of the other, and that, that was the reason of the difference of the style in regard to the Doctor. It is a kindness this worthy good man hath done me by laying in a censure of my sheets before hand, and so prevented the sugillations of this Author. As I need not therefore, so I shall forbear any retortions of that kind, and address my self to my little task before me.

It begins, page 557. To State this matter, and to lay a foundation for an Answer to the Question *what the Church of England is, and who is the Constitutive Regent part of it*, he distinguishes between a National Church considered as a Church, and as incorporated in the State (p. 558.) and then speaks to both.

For this distinction, if he had said the *Church of Christ* may be considered *in its self*, and as *incorporated in the State*, it had been a good distinction, but to say the *National Church* may have this double consideration, it is not good, because the Church is *National* onely under the last consideration. The Church of Christ considered *in its self* is either *Universal* or *Particular*, but it must be considered as *incorporated in the State* to make it *National*. This quick Antagonist hath the sagacity to perceive this, and therefore cites these words of mine, page 559. 'To be Particular or Universal is Essential to Christs Church, but to be National is of Accidental consideration. *If this be true* (now says he) *then is my distinction* (that is this distinction) *quite out of doors*, for it is a Church (that is a National Church) as it is the State (as it is in the State, he should say,) and Headed by the *Civil Magistrate*. This is well, and what hath he then to object against me, and to say for himself?

Against me, he says, *There are two things* (p. 560.) *supposed in my Argument* (which he hath candidly-delivered) *as necessary to the being of a National Church that are not necessary, That all the people* (that is the generality) *of the Nation should be Christian, and that the King should be so also*. These two things, I had said, were Accidental to the Church of Christ, and yet goe to the making our Church *National*, and consequently the Church of Christ is *National* onely under an *Accidental* consideration. But these two things he Objects are not to be supposed necessary to a National Church. I answer, when we speak of a National Church, our owne is always to be understood, about which the dispute is, and our Church is a National Political Church, no otherwise but upon this account, and the *supposition* hereof is necessary to it.

For himself, he says, *There were great Combinations before Constantine's days Patriarchal, Metropolitan, which are of the same nature with what we call National Churches*. I Answer, A *Patriarchal Church*, and a *Metropolitan Church* is not a Church *National*. A Patriarchate may contain in it the Christians of many Nations, A Metropolitan but *half* the Christians of one, and so the one is too big, and the other too little to be a National Church, and a Diocesan much less. By a National Church we commonly understand (I apprehend) a Political Church
wherein

wherein all the particular Christians and Churches in a Nation, and these only, are combined under one Government, through the Supream Magistrate, to Church purposes. A Metropolitan Church is no combination of them *all*, and a Patriarchal a combination of *more* than all. The one and the other may be called *Churches*, but neither one or other a *National* Church, which he himself *takes* to be such a *Union*.

But he *cannot tell* (he says p. 561.) why it is Accidental to the Church of Christ to be *National* any more than to be *Universal* or *Patriarchal* and *Metropolitcal* any more than *Universal* : but when I *tell him* that the Body of Christ (which is his Church) may subsist though there were never a Patriarch or Metropolitan in the Earth, I hope he can see (if he will) how the consideration of the Church as *Patriarchal* or *Metropolitcal*, and so *National*, must be Accidental to it. And as for Christs command of planting Churches (p. 16.) in the whole world, and so in Nations, and Cities, and Towns, requiring Unity and Communion every where among Christians, it may warrant the Combinations of Patriarchal, Metropolitcal, National, Diocesan, and Parochial Churches to this end, if he please, provided only, that these forms be held *Accidental forms* according to *humane* prudence, and not the *Essential form* of the Church of Christ according to *divine institution*.

To the question whether a National Church be Political, he offers something (p. 562.) and says the Dean in his Opinion hath answered with *great Judgment* in his denying *any necessity of a Constitutive Regent part to be Essential to a National Church*. But I will make it appear, that either the Dean or his Defender, do speak here with *little Judgment*. It is the Notion this Author hath proposed to publick consideration, that the Bishops in every Nation are to Govern the Church by consent, that is as Colleagues, *per litteras formatas* when they convene not, and when they do by their Canons in a Convocation. This he makes throughout his Book to be of Christs appointment, holding Episcopacy to be *Jure Divino* with others of his party. If this then be true, this Author hath found out a *Constitutive Regent part*, yea an *Ecclesiastical* Constitutive Regent part of the Church in every Nation, where there are Christians, and Bishops. And when he hath found out a Head for the Doctor, how can he thus applaud the Doctors answer, that denies the Church to have one, or says,

there is no necessity of any. When he does prove it to be a Church Political, and the Doctors answer includes a denial of it to be so, how comes this man to be so full of reverence here with these words in his mouth? *To this the Dean answers, in my poor Opinion, with great Judgment and Consideration.* It is with great Judgment indeed, is it not, that the Dean hath given up the Cause of the Bishops? And with great Judgment, is it not, that this man hath assumed the Prerogative of the King to their Colledge? Let him take heed least he bring himself into question:

Many Churches Associated for mutual help and concord, are a Church only in a loose sense; but those that are constituted of one Regent and subordinate part, are Churches in a Political proper sense. It is no body Political without one common Governour Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical. Thus says Mr. Baxter (p. 563.) Unto which says this Author, *Herein does his strength (p. 564.) consist.*

Ans. I acknowledge it does, and what hath he to weaken it? I will Transcribe what he says: 'If we deny this, that though a National Church be one body, yet it is not such a Political body as he describes, (which differs from secular forms of Government, by that ancient Canon of our Saviour, *It shall not be so among you*) the controversy may be at an end, and a National Church may be one body in an Ecclesiastical, though not in a Civil Political sense.

This is the help the Dean must expect from his Defender, and if the Doctor be not ashamed of his own answer for this defence sake, I know not what should put any man to shame. This man tells me in his Preface, he *will interpose between the Dean and shame in this Controversie.* Upon this account therefore I will take leave to tell him, that he does here manifestly betray a raw ignorance which ought to shame him. He understands the term *Political* to be Commensurate with *Civil*; as if a Government *Ecclesiastical* could not be *Political*, as well as a Government *Civil*; that is, as if a Church could not be *Political* as well as other *Societies.* He does yet discover the same more then by words; for he hath found out a Head for the Church which is *Aristocratical*, and yet thinks the Church cannot be *Political*, unless it have some Head that is *Personal*: or as if a Head *Collective* were not *One Head*, as well as one that is *Monarchical.* This man who hath interposed between shame and

and the Doctor, must take shame upon him, seeing he calls upon me to *do my part honestly*, in the same place. I say this man hath found an Ecclesiastical Constitutive Head of the Church, and that of Christs own Institution, if he understands what he drives at; and yet he and the Doctor will not allow the Church of England to be Political. I will advise him to consult with Bishop Gunning, and the excellently learned, and yet humble Mr. Dodwell who are living, seeing he hath not taken his Notions from Bramhal, or any other who are dead, (as I conjecture) that he may be instructed better, before we hear any more from him.

Mr. Baxter indeed understands himself throughly, and tells us *Association of Churches for Concord (gratia Unitatis,) are no proper Churches*: But an *United Colledge of Bishops for government (gratia Regiminis)* is a formal Ecclesiastical Head, about which was the Original Question. And this, this bold, and herein but half informed Author (who will interpose between shame and the Doctor) doth not understand neither, and as soon as he hath read this, will he own the shame he hath taken upon him? Above all, is there any man (unless so forward a one) would ever have produced that saying of our Saviour, *It shall not be so among you*, for the proving a National Church to have no Head, or that the Churches of Christ must not therefore be Political? I shall not be blamed I hope therefore if I say now again what I said to the Doctor; That if this man be not ashamed for himself and the Doctor, I must be ashamed for them both. If we deny this (says he) the Controversie were at an end: Well, but when it cannot be denied, we must look farther.

P. 565. *We grant (says he) a National Church is a Political Society; for Government by consent without Superiority is Government. I grant too Church Governours united and governing by consent are the Pars Imperans, and the people submitting to such Government in obedience to the Commands of our Saviour, are the Pars Subdita, and all this is true without a constitutive Regent Head.* I Answer, if he grants (or rather asserts) thus much, *a Government by consent*, understanding by it the Episcopal Colledge, or Cyprians One Episcopacy as the Governing part, and the People by the Law of Christ subdite to it; then hath he found out a Constitutive Head, and an Ecclesiastical Constitutive Head by Christs Institution: and

and to say that *all this is true without one*, is to me a perfect contradiction.

When he goes on then (p. 566.) to prove that *this is all, that is, or can be required to make a National Church One*, by two Arguments, I answer, If there be *so much as this* indeed required, his two Arguments must prove it not onely to be *One*, but one *Political* proper Church with an Ecclesiastical Constitutive Regent part to it. *The Bishops* (he says) *have equal power* by Christs appointment, and *rule not by Superiority, but by Consent*, that is not by Superiority over one another, but they do rule by a Superiority (I hope) over the people, and that is an Aristocratical Government : and when the People do consent to *Unite in Communion with them*, this makes them Members (he says) of that Political body : And these are his two reasons (p. 566, and 567.) which need no other Animadversion, but this notice of them. The great questions onely are whether this indeed be the will of Christ, that the Catholick, and so every National Church (as he states the matter) should be ruled by these Bishops as Colleagues, that is by a Government (as he calls it) by consent, and if it be, how it should come to pass that we have not in England such a Government, where there is for certain no such Rule by consent of the Colledg without a Superiority, but by a Superiority (or a Supremacy) of the King, who is the Head of these Bishops themselves, as well as the Nation. This I make not my Province.

P. 568. He hath four things for the strengthening the Government of his Mintage, and then concludes that *if Mr. Baxter can give him one reason why this may not be called one Church, or Ecclesiastical Body Politick without a Constitutive Regent part, he will think farther of it*. To which I answer, and tell him presently why this cannot be called one Church or Ecclesiastical Body Politick without a Constitutive Regent part, the reason is, because it is a Body Politick Ecclesiastical with a Constitutive Regent part ; and so he need think no farther of it.

And this Answer being of another nature then that which he fancies like to be made him in the next page (p. 569.) I need say nothing to that, nor the next (p. 570.) but come on to p. 571. for now he hath prepared the way, as he says, to justify the Doctor. Well, where there is a Political Church says Mr.

Mr. Baxter, there must be a Constitutive Head. The Doctor answers, there may be *the true notion of a Church* without one. I Reply, This is a coming off, but the question indeed at the bottom, is, whether it be the *true notion of the Church of England?*

The Doctor argues, *If it be necessary that every Church must have a Constitutive Regent part as essential to it, then it unavoidably follows, that there must be a Catholick Visible Head to the Church Catholick Visible.* This Argument the Deans Defender thinks *unanswerable.* But we reply, the Argument is such, as *needs no Answer,* and it may *easily be Answered.*

In the first place it needs no Answer, because the thing it would prove, is but what we can grant him; that is, a *Visible Head to the Catholick Church.* Christ is that *Head* we say, and he is *Visible.* When he was on earth he gave *Laws* for his Church, and Commissioned Officers, which are *Rights* of a Head; He after appeared to *Paul,* and Commissioned him, and is now *Visible* in Heaven. This is plain proof in Reason, Sense and Scripture, and not to be jeered off, and therefore in the *first* place the Doctors Argument *needs no Answer.*

In the next place we say farther, *it is easily Answered;* for we deny the Argument. *If it be necessary for a Church to have a Constitutive Head,* it follows that the *Catholick Church* must have a *Constitutive one:* but it follows not that it must have a *Catholick Visible Head* or that, that *Constitutive Head* must be *Visible.*

This in truth is introducing four Terms into the Argument which we know is false Arguing. When there is put more into the thing Asserted in the Consequence, then there is to prove it in the Antecedent in an Hypothetical Syllogisme, it is all one as to argue with four terms in a Syllogism that is Categorical. But the Doctor (says he) puts more strength in it. *The question is about the Catholick Church, whereof particular Churches are parts, and they being Visible do require the Constitutive Regent part to be Visible.* I Answer, though here be more words, here is no more strength put into the Argument, I still deny the Consequence. For though the *Catholick Church* consists of *Particular Churches* which are *Visible,* it consists also of that *society in heaven* which is *not Visible,* Christs Body is but one Body, whereof part is in *Heaven,* and part on *Earth,* and while the Head is in Heaven,

it follows not, that because part of the Body is Visible, therefore the Head must be Visible. It is all one as if he should argue thus. Particular Churches are *on Earth*, and if Christ be Head of the Catholick Church whereof they are parts, he must not be *in Heaven*. And when indeed this is one and the same Argument, and we know it to be false, we do justly deny the Doctors Argument. Suppose a man so high as that his head reached above the clouds, will you argue, that this person hath no head, because his head is not visible? I deny the Argument.

There is really nothing hard in the Doctors Argument, but to understand why his Defender (whom I value for his Parts) should come to think it *unanswerable*. It may be the Doctors confident word at first, [*it undenyably follows*] drew on this apprehension, and he hath fetcht the Argument over so long, till he hath put enough in it, to make himself believe it. *We are far* (says he) *from asserting that the Universal Head must be Visible if the Subordinate be so* (he should be as far from asserting the Head to be Visible, because Particular Churches or the Members are so:) *but this we assert; that if no Church can be a true Visible Church without a Subordinate Visible Head, then the Universal Church cannot be a Visible Church without a Subordinate Catholick Visible Head*, p. 574, 575, 576. This he takes to be the Doctors Argument, and he will make the consequence hold before he has done with it. But against whom does the Doctor and this man argue? Is it not against Mr. Baxter? and did Mr. Baxter ever say this, that there can be no true Church without a Subordinate Head under Christ? Is not Mr. Baxter a Protestant as well as the Doctor, and do they not both maintain the Catholick Church to have one onely Supreme Head and no Subordinate one in Earth? If his Defender hath found out one who is not the Pope, but the Colledge of Bishops, I desire Doctor Stillingfleet to appear above board, and to let us know whether he will set up also for that notion, and defend his Defender.

Mr. Baxter is a man who understood Politicks, and stated what he understood, but the Doctor was (at the present) raw, and put into his arguing he did not know well what (that is the truth on't,) and so far as this man hath undertaken to

interpose between shame and the Doctor. I will tell them both plainly, the Doctor may be ashamed to put in a fourth Term into his Argument, and this man truly takes the shame on him, by bringing in a fifth also. That which Mr. Baxter said, was this, *That every proper Political Church must have a Constitutive Head,* and the Doctor both leaves out the words *Proper, Political,* and brings in the term *Visible: Therefore the Catholick Church* (says he) *must have a Constitutive Visible Head.* The Interposer now to take off this shame from the Doctor, hath taken the right course (I say) for he comes and does worse, and that is, puts in a fifth term also into the Argument. *If every Church* (when he should say every Proper Political Church only, if he speaks to Mr. Baxter) *must have a Visible Subordinate Constitutive Head, then must the Catholick Church have such a one:* But that having no such a one, a National Church as well as the Catholick may be without a Constitutive Head. This is the Reasoning in the summe (I say in the *sum*, for it is no matter for more of his words) that puts me and Mr. Baxter (as he says) at such a loss, as is *irrecoverable.* And does he not indeed take off the shame from the Doctor by taking it thus upon himself? Suppose another should put a sixth term into the Argument, and argue, *If no Church can be a true Visible Church without a Visible Subordinate Monarchical Constitutive Head, then cannot the Catholick Church visible be a true Church without a Visible Subordinate Monarchical Constitutive Head,* Who could doubt now any longer but Mr. Baxter must yield to a plain Confutation, or bring in the Pope presently without remedy? But did Mr. Baxter. I pray lay down the *Proposition*, from which, this *Consequence*, by this means, is indeed made unavoidable? No, you will say this were to wrong Mr. Baxter to put in the term *Monarchical* (and would spoil this mans *Government by Consent* quite:) I say likewise, that this Author wrongs him to put in this term *Subordinate*, and the Doctor by putting in the term *Visible.* Mr. Baxter hath neither of these terms in his Assertion, and if you cannot argue from what he hath said that the Pope is Head of the *Catholick Church Visible*, you cannot argue from him that it hath any *Subordinate Head*, or *Visible*, but a *Constitutive Head* only, whether *Visible* or *Invisible.* It is nothing else but the Fallacy whereby the Opponent puts in more into the Argument then is granted by the Respondent (which I

T

think

think we called at the University *Fallacia plurium interrogationum vel dictionum*, for whether the diverse things are interrogated or argued the Paralogism is the same,) that hath made all this pother as this man phrases it, which seeing it is on their side, I will give over any farther pursuit of this Chapter.

There is one thing only, and that is the main thing not to be omitted. The Dean in his Determination of this point does hold that *Consent is sufficient to the making a National Church*, understanding by that *Consent*, a Consent to be of it. The Deans Defender holds the Church to be a Government by *Consent*, meaning by it the *Consent of the Bishops*. These are two contrary things, the one making the Church *not Political*, and the other makes it an *Aristocracy*, and yet intends to justify the former. But neither of them are in the right. The Church of *England*, is not a Church by *Consent only* without a Head, nor a *Government by Consent*, by the Colledge of Bishops: but it is a Political Church with a Constitutive Regent part, which is the King, according to my Papers.

That the King is the Head of it appears by the Statute that declares him *Head* of the Church, as it is called *the Church of England*. It appears by other *Acts* that give him the same Supremacy the Pope usurped. It appears by the First Fruits and Tenths of all Benefices given him as the Supream Head of the Church. It appears by *Cromwell* who was made *Henry* the Eighth Vicar General and Vicegerent, and sate in the *Convocation* as Personating the Head of it. It appears by this Reason of my Book. Where the Rights of Majesty are, there must the Headship be placed. *Legislation* and the *Last appeal* belong to him. It is the King gives Authority to the Canons, in so much as when a Law cannot pass without a Parliament, the *Canons* becomes valid by the Kings own Ratification. And there can be no Appeal in any Ecclesiastical cause from the King. Again, it appears most unanimously by the Ministers Prayers every Sunday, giving him the Title of Supream Head, and by the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance. If the King be not the Head accordingly, then must the Clergy generally be both Lyars and Perjured Persons.

From this truth then (which is beyond opposition) it follows, that a National Church is of Humane appointment and not of Divine

Divine right that is indispenfible : It follows that it belongs not to the *Eſſence* of the *Church of Chriſt* to be *National*, but that this is a conſideration *accidental* to it. It follows that ſuch a Church may receive its Conſtitution at firſt, and a new form or mould at any time , as is moſt convenient to the State, and moſt conducive to the glory of God in the good of the People. It follows that a Reformation of the Government of our Church by the introducing ſome ſuch new form into it as ſhall be *more* conducive to the ends of Holineſs and Peace *than* the preſent Form does, were a moſt deſireable thing, and fit to be tendred to the Wiſdom of Parliament. It follows finally that ſeeing the model that is hammering by this Author is propoſed as ſtrictly of Divine Right, which is therefore the moſt direfull Schiſmatical Scheme that can be propoſed in regard to Diſſenters, excluding them thereby out of the body of Chriſt, and conſequently from ſalvation, beſides dangerous to the Supremacy of the Magiſtrate, and unanswerably faulty in many reſpects, ſo that it cannot be received or indured, it is fit that a model more agreeable to the power which is proper to Kings, and leſs exceptionable in regard to the Conſcience of the Subject, were exhibited in the room of it ; and if it be ſuch as would make the *Prelates* onely the *Kings* Officers (*to execute under him ſuch Government of the Church as belongeth to Kings*, as this Author ſo well expreſſes it, (p. 275.) ſo as the Nonconformiſt and Conformiſt may ſhare : I ſhall not for the diſlike of any one or two men, or party (who are deſigning an Antipodes to it) be at all out of love with it. And ſeeing there is a draught to this purpoſe which he alludes to, and (whatſoever the humor be) does ſtyle an *ingenious propoſal*, I adviſe that it be preſerved and inſerted therefore at the end of the Book if you Print it. The Paper (you know) was prepared againſt the Sitting of the laſt Parliament at *Oxford*, and Entituled *Materials for Union*.

And now I have done about my ſelf, you may expect from me ſome more general cenſure of the Author and his Book, which I was willing to decline.

For the Author (whatſoever he elſe be) I take him to be a man of Ability that requires our regard. By his Stile and Undertaking, I gueſs him to be a man of younger age, (ſo I hear and believe) though by his reading and compaſs he fetches for the making good his Notion, he may be ſome graver Perſon. In the ſmall

game he plays with me I perceive he hath hit me, and I ought not to like him the worse for that. It is where I lay open to him, and left him a blot. But for the defence he makes of the Doctor against me, I think he hath failed in his cast, and thrown out. He is a man I count hath a *Proud Pen*, and I am not moved at that: but the Doctor whose Pen is more Prudential, seemed to me to have his contempt *within*, and that moved me, do what I could, and made me write as I did. There are many (I believe) will think that this man hath despised me so much that it should move me: but I do not think it so much. The man is a bold insolent man, and it is (I think) the taking a ferocious liberty, rather than shewing disdain. He hath used Mr. *Baxter* like a very dog, and when I methinks am but something rightly served, why should I care how he uses me? I will do nothing more to deserve it, and if he despises me, I know then how to be even with him, I wont care if he does.

For the Book, I think the Bookseller hath done his part. The Paper and Print is to be like't: but for the matter I think it to dear at the price. Five Shillings (I must tell him with some displeasure) is too unreasonable much for such Controversie. There are three or four things more particularly I have observed in the Reading it.

In the first place I observe the Design which appears to be in hand. A design which seems specious, being for Union: but that Union is of the Church of *England* with the Church of *Rome*, in the *French* and *Cassandrian* way, not a Union of Protestant Dissenters and the Conformists with one another. On the contrary, this Gentleman thus discourses. The Christian Church throughout the whole world is One, The Unity of this Church Catholick lies in One Communion. This Communion is exercised in Particular Churches. There are no true Particular Churches of Christs Institution, and parts of that Catholick, but they must have Bishops. Every man consequently that is not in Communion with his Bishop, is out of the true Catholick Church which consists of such parts, and so not only a Schismatick, but cut off from Salvation. Either this Author now is aware of this Doctrine or not: If not, as soon as he comes to be, he will be ashamed of it: if he already be, he may be ashamed to own such Doctrine as this is.

In

In the next place I observe a little, how consistent he is in this Doctrine. For when he hath bestowed a whole Chapter (p. 164.) to tell us that the Unity of the Universal Christian Church consists in *one Communion*, and descends to explain that Communion by a Communication of the same Divine Service (for when Dr. Owen is speaking of a Communion between the Churches in Faith and Love, *He ought to have added* (says he) *in Religious Worship, for without this there is no Christian Communion*, (p. 446.) which he also urges so far as to make a forsaking Communion with the Church of *England* to be a cutting a man quite off from the Church of Christ; and yet if you turn to p. 305. you shall find these words. *The Nature and Essence of the Church does not consist in Religious Assemblies— but it is a Covenant Relation to Christ which Constitutes the Church.* Here then we have sounder Doctrine, for these two are different things. If an entering into Covenant with Christ is that really which Constitutes a man a member, and unites him to the Body, then is it not this *One Communion* wherein the Unity of that Body does consist. A man may give himself up to Christ I hope, who yet does not, and cannot communicate with the Church of *England*, and though he own not the Bishops, may be a Christian for all that.

In the third place I observe this, that when he hath said some things well about the Text which the Doctor chose for his Sermon (p. 447, 448.) yet is he very unsatisfactory in bringing off the Doctor, or vindicating his judgment in his choice of it for his purpose. There were some in the Apostles time that thought the Jewish Law still obligatory, and that they should sin against God if they did not keep it: and there were others understood the liberty they had from it by the Gospel. The *first* of these are called the *weak brother*, the *last* the *perfect*. The advice the Apostles gives to the *perfect* is to use and enjoy that liberty which the Gospel brought them: The advice he gives the *weak*, is to wait till God should reveal to them the knowledge of this liberty. And in the mean while that they should forbear, seeing, *To them who esteem any thing to be sin, it is sin*: and this he presses still so far, and with such exceeding caution that the strong Christian himself must refrain his liberty for their sakes, in case that by his example he shall give them occasion to do the same thing, which in regard to their not yet sufficiently in-
formed

formed consciences would be sin, and destroy their souls. This is the certain sense and diffusive doctrine of St. Paul in his Epistles. I will come then to the Doctors Text, *Whereto we have attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing*, and I must ask his Defender whether the *weak* and *perfect* Christian (as before explained) be here both included, I mean whether both of these are alike required in the Text to *walk by the same rule*? This Author does hold it, and he frames such an interpretation of the words as he must hold it: but I deny it, and that interpretation therefore must be counterfeit. By *walking by the same rule* he understands the *maintaining Church Communion*, and this Communion with the Church he counts must be held, howsoever it be we differ. This is therefore a fictitious and certain false application or explication of the Text, for it is directly contrary to the scope of that Doctrine which I have but now delivered as the summe or substance of the Apostle in his Epistles altogether. I say also that this is manifestly here destitute of reason. The Apostle requires that all Christians should *walk by the same rule in things whereto they have attained*, Therefore they must walk by the same rule in things whereto they have *not attained*. Such is his force. This *walking by the same rule* I am perswaded is a phrase or expression onely, signifying *the doing as others doe*. Now because they that had the knowledge of their liberty might doe as others did, and were to use it, must those that had not that knowledg do so likewise? The contrary is apparent, for they shall sin against their consciences if they doe. The like case is here. The Conformist among us looks upon all and every of those things that are enjoined about Uniformity in the Church to be lawfull, and he values himself for *perfect* in this discerning indifferent things, but the Nonconformist thinks these things unlawfull, and that he shall sin if he yields to them, and what if herein he be *weak*, must the weak and perfect, must both these here now *walk by the same rule, or do as one another do*? Nay must there be a Rule made on purpose by Authority about these very things wherein the difference lies to force them to act both alike, when one of them (if they do) cannot possibly act in faith, and so must needs sin? Nothing more contrary to what I have laid down, Nothing more contrary to the Doctrine of the Apostle. I will add, if by this *Rule* there be more meant then a Phrase,

a Phrase, and some Rule he will account there must be, I would fain know why this Rule should be any other then that of the same Apostle elsewhere, *As many as walk according to this rule, peace be upon them and the Israel of God.* And what is that Rule, but Christianity it self, the great Rule of the Christian Religion, or Doctrine of the Gospel? And what then will follow from thence! The Doctor I remember reflects upon my *Peaceable Design* for being called an *Answer to his Sermon*: I will undertake now upon this Supposition, that, *that Title was as fit for my Book, as this Text was for his Sermon.* Because we must walk according to the general rule of the Christian Religion, in all things that are required of us, as we attain to the knowledg thereof, Therefore we must Conform to the Canons and Liturgy of the Church of *England.* This is the Doctors Sermon upon that Text; and I will tell you the Inference now of his Defender upon that Sermon, Therefore must all that *Conform not*, in the excluding themselves from Communion with the Church of *England*, be excluded also out of the Catholick Church, and consequently out of the Kingdome of Heaven.

By the way, since I wrote this, I was reading Doctor Owen, and I find that he falls in with the last Interpretation of the Rule, and he hath these words upon it. *Let the Apostles rule be produced (says he) with any probability of proof to be his, and we are ready to subscribe and conform to it.* To which Doctor Stillingfleet Replies, ' This is the Apostles rule, to go as far as they can, and if they can go no farther to sit down, and not to break the ' peace of the Church.' Unto this Dr. Owen Answers, *The Apostles rule is not that we should go as far as we can, but that so far as we have attained we must walk by the same rule.* I interpose here and say to the Doctor, This is, this must be the rule of the Apostle, supposing that rule be meant as he understands it, that is, of the *great rule of faith and love*, or law of the Gospel. For this is part of *that Rule.* It is part of *that love* we owe the Magistrate and our Conforming Brethren to go as far as we can, or to come as near as we can to them. But I answer then to the Dean, It is part also of the same Rule to go no farther then we can. Our duty of *love* requires the one: Our duty of *faith* requires the other. We may not doe any thing which we cannot doe in faith but we break the rule as it is the *rule of faith*, as well

as

as if we do not do what we can, we shall break the rule, as it is the *rule of love*. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Now when the Dean hereupon goes on, and teaches us, that *we must sit down and not break the peace of the Church when we can go no farther*, I Reply, there is a breaking the peace of the Church in *his* sense, or in *ours*. If we understand *breaking the peace of the Church* in his sense, which is going from the Church to our Meetings, I say he is out, and that we must *break the peace of the Church* if this be the breaking it, for this is that which is required of us in that branch of the Rule, that *we must go no farther then we can*: But when we go to private Meetings and leave the Church in this case (where we suppose a man cannot act in faith, or with perswasion in his conscience that it is lawful for him to go thither,) it is no breaking the peace of the Church in our sense, but a part of our duty (wee say) of going *no farther then we can*. We go as far as we can with them in holding the same Doctrine and Sacraments, in acknowledging them as true Churches, maintaining a Communion in love with them, and doing all the good offices we can to them, and when we *can go no farther*, in this lyes our duty of going *no farther then we can*, that we meet for worship elsewhere. To assemble (I say) for worship is one part of the rule: Not to assemble, (but to forbear any thing,) when we cannot act in faith, is another part of the rule: Put them both together and it comes to this, that, To go to other meetings when we cannot go to Church must be walking by the rule (if this rule be the great rule of faith and of love) out of question.* This I speak in the person of Doctor Owen; who can and do go to Church my self: but there is one eminent thing said by that eminent great man, and very much accomplished Doctor. *We do and shall abide by this Principle (p. 250.) that Communion in faith and love with the administration of the same Sacraments is sufficient to preserve all Christians from the guilt of Schism, though they cannot communicate together in some rites and rules of Worship and Order.* If the Doctor makes good this, he does our work: and till the Dean debates this, he says nothing.

To return, I observe in the fourth place (for the Digression it self does but lead me hither) that this Authour does industriously endeavour to bring the Controversie between Conformist and

and Nonconformist to this issue. If the Church requires of us any things as necessary to her Communion which are sinful, the schism is on her part. If not, the schism is on ours. To what end he does this, unless there be some body else entertaining the task which the Doctor ought, I cannot tell: but if this be supposed the true case between us, then should the business here that Doctor *Stillingsfleet* had to doe, have been this, To see what things are alledged by the Nonconformists as Unlawful in the point of Conformity (whereof there was a tast first in the Peaceable Design, and a fuller measure after in Mr. *Baxters* Plea) and then to have answered those Allegations. If the Doctor was able sincerely and substantially to have done this, then hath he declined his work: if indeed he cannot (at least on the Ministers part he cannot), then hath he yielded the Nonconformist his Cause. The Doctors Defender seeing this, does endeavour to supply his defect, and speaks to many of these things: but I must tell him he has done it in such an overly way, with such misrepresentation of Mr. *Baxter*, such incidental mistakes, such slight and perfunctory answers, that I do not apprehend he believes in his heart that what he hath said can give satisfaction. I will content my self with one instance to shew him this. It is in the matter of Assent and Consent, to all and every thing contained in, and prescribed by the two Books of the Liturgy and Orders. 'Tis plain by these words, that whatsoever is *Asserted* in these Books we must give our assent to the truth of it, as whatsoever is *prescribed* we must consent to the use of it. How vast a Field then have we here for our Objections against this Declaration, and yet does this Author come off thus. *We do not give our assent to every saying in the Common Prayer Book, but to every thing contained in and prescribed by it, that is what we are bound to use*, p. 105. And does this man now think indeed this enough to satisfy a Conscientious man in any thing which he scruples upon this account? Is this distinction enough to save the matter? We do not assent to the *Sayings* of the Book but to the *Things*? as if whatsoever is *said* in the Book were not *something* that is *contained in it*: Or as if there was nothing to be assented to as true, but what is *prescribed* to be used. Good Lord! what Healers are we like to have of such men as these be? They should set themselves to *satisfie us*, in such Solutions of our Objections, as our Consciences being convinced of the Solidity

might acquiesc in them : but their care is only to *satisfie themselves*, and no matter so long as they come off with any *Evasion*.

In the last place, there remains some passages this Author hath here and there in his Book, and more indultuously in his Preface, on set purpose to expose me, in an ill representing some of my expressions, without regard to the *matter* between us, whether it be any thing or nothing ; which though it can *hardly be well* (as to me) to asperse a man for the aspersion sake, (when as to Mr. Baxter it is (I Judge) even *irreligiously ill*) yet do I readily forgive it him, upon this double account. The *one* is, because when I wrote these sheets I think I was to blame, that having written them foul, I could not abide to be at the pains to write them over fair, (which yet I thought to have done) and then I should have castigated such expressions, that now in his exposing them again to me do not like me (some of them), as indeed not *cautious* enough for *my self*, or *respectful* enough for the *Doctor*. I am ready to crave the Doctors pardon, which is my best satisfaction for that. The *other* is because the Author does it out of respect to so worthy a person as him he vindicates (not out of malice to me), and one may think it but a friendly Office for him to do so : But I do think also that Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself ought not to pass it so lightly, who hath the more cause to be aware of him, and to say the rather, *Get thee behind me Sherlock*, thou art one that wouldst foment my pride, when others (I am to believe) have more honestly endeavoured to let me see it, that I may be humbled to God for it.

If it was meerly for peace sake, and out of tenderness to the Nonconformists, seeking their good at his heart as in the sight of God, that Dr. *Stillingfleet* Preached his Sermon, and writ his Book, the good Lord pardon every man that hath had but one hard thought, or spake one hard word of so good and learned a man : but if it was really otherwise, if it was to appear some body, to seek himself, and in lifting himself up against his Brethren without regard to the consequence, the righteous God is ready to take the least hurt he does them to be all one as done to himself, then the good Lord pardon him (for he hath sinned much), and bring him to see (though at last) unto whom he is indeed more behold-ing (or from whom he is indeed like to receive most good), either him that *licketh up his spittle*, or him that hath *rebuked his faults*.

The Author of the Peaceable Design.

Materials

Materials for Union. By M^r. J^r. Humphreys

WHereas there are three Parties of *Protestants* in the Nation, the *Episcopalian*, the *Presbyterian*, and the *Independent* (or *Congregational*-Men, which are of diverse sorts) who do, and will ever differ in their Opinions about the *Church*, and *Discipline* of it, in the Question, which is of Christ's Institution ; or, Whether the One, or the Other, is most consonant to Scripture : it is not our Disputes about the Church as *Particular* (which are rather to be mutually forbore, and every Party left herein to their own Perswasion) but a Common Agreement in what we *Can* Agree, and that is in the Church as *National*, must **Heal** our Divisions.

*It is here we must lay the Foundation-Stone of *Union*.

When the Parliament then shall set about this business to purpose, A Bill should be brought in for *Declaring* the *Constitution* of Our Church of *England*.

A Parliament is the Representative of the whole People of *England*, and I doubt not, but by Consent and Agreement, they might *Make* a New Constitution of the CHURCH, as it is *National* ; and much more may they *Declare* the Constitution of it.

The Papists are for one Universal Organical Church throughout the world, whereof the Pope is Head by Christ's Appintment ; and whosoever consequently is not of this *Roman Catholick*-Church, and Governed by him, must be damned. There are some of our late Prelatists are for the same Church, but under the Diocesan

Bishops of the whole Earth, who being Convened in a *General Council*, are the *Head* that must give laws to it; and whosoever refuse to be Govern'd by the Laws of these General Counsels, are *Schismatics*. I am much rather therefore, in my mind, for the Notion (which is that in the Embryo the Reverend Dean of *St. Pauls* seems to me to aim at, if it could be once well formed) of an *Independent National Church* Political, but not to be held, as the Congregationalist supposes his *Particular Independent One*, and They their Catholick, to be of *Divine*, but of *Humane Institution*; for it is manifestly a thing *Accidental* to the Church of Christ, that the Supream Magistrate, and the whole Body of a Nation, are Christian.

It should be declared then in such a Bill or Act of Parliament, that the Church of *England* consists of the King as the Head, and all the several Assemblies of the Protestants as the Body.

A Discrimination between the *Tolerable* and *Intolerable* is never to be gain-said by any Wise Man.

It is not for me, or any *One* person, but a *Convocation*, or *Parliament*, to prescribe the Terms of *National Communion*; but I would have all our *Assemblies* that are *Tolerable*, to be made *Legal* by such an *Act*, and thereby parts of the *National Church*, as well as the *Parochial Congregations*.

That the Bishops should be declared Ecclesiastical Officers under the KING, acting *Circa Sacra* only by Vertue of *His* Authority and Commission.

As

As *Jehoshaphat* appointed Officers for Government in the *Matters of God*, and the *Kings Matters* : So should the *Bishops* be in Our *Ecclesiastical*, as the *Judges* are in *Civil Matters*, the Substitutes of his Majesty, and Execute *His Jurisdiction*.

Upon this Account, if any of the Eminent among the Non-conformists were Chosen to be Bishops, they could not refuse it.

Let two or three the most fit of those Parties be the next that are called to this Function upon such an Act, and commanded to Hold it, and then would UNION indeed Commence.

Their Work in general, should be to Supervise the Churches of both sorts in their Diocesses, that they all Walk according to their own Order, agreeable to the Gospel, and the Peace of one another.

I am sensible unto what Distress a Congregational Minister may be brought in the exercise of Discipline over some potent, turbulent, and refractory Members ; and what Relief he might find in such an External Ecclesiastical Officer as this. I am sensible how the many inconveniences (supposed) of Congregational Episcopacy, by this one onely means may be salved.

This shall *Advance*, and not *Lessen*, the outward Power and Honour of the *Bishops*.

I humbly Motion a *Third Clerk* for the Convocation, to be added to the *Two* in every Diocess, and chose out of the Non-conformists for the Unanimous prosecution of

of Holiness and Concord throughout all the Churches: And the two Provinces of *Canterbury* and *York* should Unite in this *Convocation*, for the making them one *National Church*, and not two *Provincial* ones in a diverse Assembly.

By this means should one *Organ* more be added to this great *Political Society* for deriving an influence from this Head to *these* parts of the *Body* as well as *Others*, which now seem neglected, and to have no care taken of them.

It were the part of *such a Convocation* to Decree that neither Church should Unchurch one another; That no members of Either should depart from One Church to the *Other* without a sufficient peaceable reason; That when a man hath his choice to be of *One Church*, which he will, in regard to *Fixed Communion*, he should *Occasionally* come also to the *Other* for maintaining this *National Union*.

There are these and other things of such a nature as these, I should expect then would be moulded into *Canon*s, that kindly preventing all our scruples, would render the Nation happy, in the satisfaction of both *Parties*.

An Act of Parliament to this purpose, would make the Church of *England* to be in Earnest, such a Church, as the Church-men would have us still think it, the *Best Constituted*, the most *Exemplary*, and the most *Glorious* of any that is, or indeed that well can be in this World.

But

But is not all this at last too *Erastian*? I answer, No. We suppose that every Parish where there is a Pastor and a Flock does contain in it such a Particular Church as is of Christs Institution. That Christ committed to every such Church a compleat power of Doctrine, Worship, and Discipline. That what Christ hath committed to his Church cannot be taken away by any. That the Authority of the Magistrate is for care and oversight, and so to *protect* and maintain this power, but not to *destroy* it. That the Church as National, and Diocesan as part of the National, and Parochial (*qua* Parochial) as part of the Diocesan, are of Humane institution, and owe their power, and preservation of it, to the Supream Magistrate. That as the Magistrate does not take away or invade, but preserve the *power of the Keys* (*invested* in the *Minister*, but *given* with the *Pastor* himself to the *Church*), No more can the Diocesans that Derive from him, assume it to themselves, and deprive the Particular Churches of it. That so long as this Power is preserved, there is no *Erastianism* maintained as to a *Particular Church*, and as to the *National* there is no danger of it.

And thus I have offered my Mite to the *Sanctuary*; that is, so much as I have, and what I think fit for Cultivation by Others, whom GOD shall make Wise-hearted, and Concern'd, for the Welfare of *Sion*.

There is Room also here left for the farther Invention of Such, in regard to many the like things as (or greater then) these: For they that will, may see something more in a few Sheets, in part Entituled, *Animadversions upon the Debate between Dr. Stillingfleet and Mr. Baxter, Concerning the National Church and Head of it*.

J. Humphrey

THE END.

